

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

DR. RACHEL TUDOR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. CIV-15-324-C

SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE  
UNIVERSITY and THE REGIONAL  
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF  
OKLAHOMA,

Defendants.

VOLUME 3

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBIN J. CAUTHRON

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2017; 9:15 a.m.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,  
transcript produced by computer.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Plaintiff:

Ezra I. Young  
Law Office of Ezra Young  
30 Devoe 1A  
Brooklyn, New York 11211  
ezraiyoung@gmail.com

Brittany M. Novotny  
401 North Hudson Avenue  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
brittany.novotny@gmail.com

Marie E. Galindo  
1500 Broadway  
Suite 1120  
Wellsfargo Building  
Lubbock, Texas 79401  
meggalindo@thegalindolawfirm.com

For the Defendants:

Dixie L. Coffey  
Jeb E. Joseph  
Timothy M. Bunson  
Attorney General's Office  
313 NE 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105  
dixie.coffey@oag.ok.gov  
jeb.joseph@oag.ok.gov  
tim.bunson@oag.ok.gov

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

C O N T E N T S		
	VOLUME	PAGE
PLAINTIFF WITNESSES:		
RACHEL TUDOR, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	1	37
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. COFFEY.....	1	130
CONTINUING CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. COFFEY..	2	205
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	2	209
ROBERT PARKER, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	2	212
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	2	275
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	2	291
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	2	294
MEG COTTER-LYNCH, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	2	297
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	2	353
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	2	371
JOHN MISCHO, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	3	384
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	3	409
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	3	427
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	3	430
MARK SPENCER, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	431
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	3	450
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	459
RANDY PRUS, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	3	464
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	3	470
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	3	481
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	3	486
JAMES KNAPP, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	488
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	3	504
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	507
MELINDA HOUSE		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	508
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	3	529
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	3	547

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

C O N T E N T S		
	VOLUME	PAGE
DEFENSE WITNESSES:		
LUCRETIA SCOUFOS, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. COFFEY.....	4	561
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GALINDO.....	4	597
CATHY CONWAY, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. COFFEY.....	4	635
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	4	656
DOUG McMILLAN, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	4	671
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. NOVOTNY.....	4	689
CLAIRE STUBBLEFIELD, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	4	700
CONTINUING DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH...	5	726
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GALINDO.....	5	734
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	5	754
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GALINDO.....	5	756
JESSE SNOWDEN, Ph.D.		
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JOSEPH.....	5	758
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	5	777
PLAINTIFF REBUTTAL WITNESS:		
CHARLES WEINER, Ph.D.		
REBUTTAL EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG.....	5	806
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BUNSON.....	5	811
PLAINTIFF CLOSING STATEMENT.....	5	827
DEFENSE CLOSING STATEMENT.....	5	846
VERDICT.....	6	869

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 (Proceedings held on November 15, 2017.)

2 THE COURT: Be seated.

3 I am prepared to rule on the Conway deposition.

4 All objections made by defendant are overruled except  
5 those to -- on page 175 concerning healthcare.

6 I will permit the counterdesignations to be read without  
7 limiting your direct examination of this witness because they  
8 are so brief and simply place some things in context.

9 I will direct the plaintiff to read these in order. Even  
10 though they may not be what you have designated, I want them  
11 just read straight through.

12 Ms. Coffey, I'm told you may have something before the  
13 jury comes in?

14 MS. COFFEY: Yes, Your Honor, a couple of procedural  
15 matters.

16 When we concluded yesterday afternoon, there was the  
17 issue of the availability of Judge Richard Ogden. As I had  
18 represented to the Court yesterday, Judge Ogden's schedule,  
19 due to Judge Ogden having to take responsibility for his own  
20 docket, Judge Stuart's docket, and Judge Dixon's Friday  
21 morning docket, the judge is unavailable until -- at any  
22 possible time would be Friday afternoon. That would only be  
23 if the morning docket doesn't have carry over for arguments to  
24 be taken care of.

25 Late last night, I received an e-mail after I notified,

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 early evening, plaintiff's counsel of Judge Ogden's schedule.  
2 So I received an e-mail asking if we would agree that he could  
3 be presented by deposition as a result of him being  
4 unavailable.

5 I would represent to the Court that Judge Ogden's  
6 schedule this week does not constitute unavailability under  
7 the federal rules. Had plaintiff's counsel done their job  
8 diligently and served Judge Ogden in a timely manner, as  
9 opposed to 24 hours before they asked for him to appear, any  
10 conflict could have been taken care of, and they failed to do  
11 so.

12 So his deposition designations -- I mean, we used defense  
13 strategy of not questioning during there, so we don't have  
14 that opportunity. So it's extremely prejudicial, in addition,  
15 to allow Judge Ogden to testify during our case on Friday  
16 afternoon.

17 Now, I understand that if, for some reason, plaintiff's  
18 case is still going on come Friday afternoon, that that would  
19 be a different issue.

20 MS. NOVOTNY: Yes, Judge. In regards to the time of  
21 the service, it wasn't until November 1st --

22 THE COURT: Just step to the podium. You don't have  
23 to speak right into it.

24 MS. NOVOTNY: Sure.

25 So it wasn't until November 1st that we even had a

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 for-sure trial date. The local rules require seven days  
2 between the filing of the subpoenas onto the docket to the  
3 time that they're allowed to be served.

4 So with the late notice of all the dates in this trial,  
5 it was very difficult to get everybody served in any more  
6 timely manner.

7 MS. COFFEY: May I address that, Your Honor?

8 THE COURT: Well, it's just not reasonable. It's  
9 not reasonable to -- and perhaps I am speaking from my own  
10 experience more than I usually do, but you can't just uproot a  
11 judge from a docket and misput hundreds of lawyers and clients  
12 and witnesses and parties for your benefit.

13 You have to plan ahead with somebody like that. The more  
14 busy someone is, the more burden is placed on them with short  
15 notice. And you could have served him well before -- what is  
16 today? -- well before Monday, is the day he was actually  
17 served to appear here on Tuesday.

18 It places an undue burden on him, and it's not a  
19 reasonable time. I'll leave it open for now for whether he  
20 can appear on Friday or, if some hole opens up in his  
21 schedule, that he can come some other time.

22 So I'm not going to -- well, I will rule that he is not  
23 unavailable.

24 Okay. What else?

25 MS. COFFEY: Your Honor, this morning at 7:30 a.m.,

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 plaintiff filed a subpoena to appear and testify to  
2 Dr. Charles Weiner. That subpoena requires Dr. Weiner to  
3 appear at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

4 We haven't had any opportunity to talk to Dr. Weiner, but  
5 Your Honor ruled yesterday 24 hours' notice is not reasonable.  
6 And plaintiff's counsel contradicted Your Honor's order and  
7 went ahead and filed the subpoena anyway, which I think --

8 THE COURT: I have to find not only that it's not  
9 reasonable, but that it places an undue burden. Without more  
10 information, I can't find that.

11 If it is a burden to him, then my ruling will be he  
12 cannot testify -- or will not be forced to testify. But I  
13 think it's premature to do that at this time.

14 MS. COFFEY: Your Honor, my reading of the rule is  
15 that unreasonable notice or undue burden, and definitely the  
16 unreasonable notice is applicable in this case.

17 THE COURT: It sounds like a marching band on the  
18 roof.

19 MS. COFFEY: They're having more fun.

20 THE COURT: Well, let me just take a peek at the  
21 rule.

22 MS. COFFEY: Your Honor, we don't know that  
23 Dr. Weiner has been served. The subpoena was filed. We had  
24 communicated --

25 THE COURT: Okay. Let's not worry about something

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 that hasn't arisen.

2 MS. COFFEY: Right.

3 THE COURT: Anything else?

4 MS. COFFEY: No, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Do you have witnesses this morning?

6 MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do, Your Honor. I'm going to --  
7 also wanted to say that we do have a draft verdict form as you  
8 requested.

9 THE COURT: May I have it?

10 MR. YOUNG: Yes, you may.

11 May I approach?

12 THE COURT: Just hand it to her.

13 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

14 THE COURT: Please have your next witness brought in  
15 while the jury is coming in.

16 MS. NOVOTNY: Plaintiff calls Dr. John Mischo.

17 (Jury enters.)

18 THE COURT: Good morning. Be seated.

19 Please face the clerk and be sworn, sir.

20 (Witness duly sworn.)

21 THE COURT: Be seated.

22 WHEREUPON, JOHN MISCHO, Ph.D., after having been first  
23 duly sworn, testifies in reply to the questions propounded as  
24 follows:

25 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 BY MS. NOVOTNY:

2 Q. Good morning, Dr. Mischo. Thank you for taking time out  
3 of your schedule, as the jurors and our witnesses have all  
4 done this week, to help us get a better understanding of some  
5 things that took place at Southeastern Oklahoma State  
6 University.

7 THE COURT: Ms. Novotny, let me interrupt you. In  
8 case this noise is causing you some alarm, we are having it  
9 checked into. We think there may be either a marching band on  
10 the roof or the air conditioner is struggling. So it's being  
11 checked.

12 All right. Thank you.

13 MS. NOVOTNY: Thank you.

14 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Dr. Mischo, what year did you first  
15 begin working at Southeastern?

16 A. 1992.

17 Q. What was your title at that time?

18 A. Assistant professor.

19 Q. And after some time, you gained tenure there. And when  
20 was that?

21 A. 1998.

22 Q. Okay. And when did you come to know Dr. Rachel Tudor?

23 A. When she was hired as an assistant professor.

24 Q. And did you have anything to do with that hiring?

25 A. I was on the hiring committee and part of the department

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 that voted on the hire.

2 Q. Can you -- did you say you were on the hiring committee?

3 A. Yeah, there was a hiring committee which I was on. And  
4 then the department as a whole then voted on the candidate.

5 Q. Okay. Great.

6 And so it's fair to say you're familiar with Dr. Tudor's  
7 entire career at Southeastern?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And at the time that Dr. Tudor was hired, what was your  
10 position at Southeastern?

11 A. I would have been an -- I believe an associate professor.

12 Q. And did you have tenure at that time?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, at some point after Dr. Tudor was hired, did you get  
15 promoted again?

16 A. I became department chair, yes. Well, I was also  
17 promoted to full professor.

18 Q. And what were some of your duties as chair of the  
19 department?

20 A. The department chair would schedule classes, was the  
21 primary responsibility; monitor faculty; advise students;  
22 advise faculty.

23 Q. Okay. Did you have a role in tenure and promotion  
24 decisions as chair of the department?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. And just to clarify, what department was that?

2 A. English, Humanities, and Languages.

3 Q. Thank you.

4 Now, what was your role as a department chair as it  
5 pertains to tenure and promotion decisions?

6 A. The tenure and promotion committee would meet and either  
7 recommend or not recommend a candidate applicant for promotion  
8 and/or tenure and then would submit that recommendation to me  
9 as department chair, and then I would myself then either  
10 recommend or not recommend the promotion and/or tenure.

11 Q. Great.

12 Now, I want to take you back to the summer of 2007. Do  
13 you recall a meeting in the summer of 2007 at Southeastern  
14 regarding Dr. Tudor's gender transition?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And do you recall how many people were there and who was  
17 there?

18 A. I can remember that Dean Mangrum, and Cathy Conway, the  
19 HR person, was there. I'm not certain. I think there were  
20 about four other people besides me, but I can't recall  
21 everyone who was there.

22 Q. Okay. And I know it was a long time ago, so I  
23 understand.

24 Now, do you recall anything that stuck out to you about  
25 that meeting?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. The first thing I recall was that I was called to that  
2 meeting without any indication of what the meeting was going  
3 to be about was the first thing that surprised me that I can  
4 recall, yes.

5 Q. Did anything else about that meeting stick out to you?

6 A. The meeting, as I recall, had had to do with Dr. Tudor's  
7 use of restrooms.

8 Q. And was any kind of decision or rule put in place  
9 regarding Dr. Tudor's restroom usage at that time?

10 A. It was determined that Dr. Tudor would use the, I guess,  
11 unisex -- called unisex bathroom in the building.

12 Q. Do you remember where that bathroom was?

13 A. It's on the second floor of the building.

14 Q. Do you recall if that was on the same floor where  
15 Dr. Tudor taught her classes?

16 A. No, it was one floor below.

17 Q. Was it on the same floor that Dr. Tudor had her office?

18 A. No. Dr. Tudor's office was on the third floor, and her  
19 classrooms are on the third floor.

20 Q. Did you ever have any other meetings with administration  
21 officials at Southeastern where other women in your department  
22 were specifically directed to use a particular restroom?

23 A. No.

24 Q. So other women were allowed to use the ladies room  
25 without the administration interfering?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Did administrators ever tell you to use  
4 a specific restroom?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Other than at that meeting in the summer of 2007, did  
7 anyone else ever raise any concern to you about where  
8 Dr. Tudor used the restroom?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Would it be fair to say the administration was singling  
11 Dr. Tudor out in regards to restroom usage?

12 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

13 THE COURT: Overruled.

14 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question, please.

15 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Yeah.

16 Would it be fair to say the administration seemed to be  
17 singling Dr. Tudor out in regards to restroom usage?

18 A. That would be hard to say. I don't know of any other  
19 situation like that that I'm aware of. So I don't know that I  
20 could say.

21 Q. At any time in your tenure at Southeastern have you had  
22 any other professors directed to use a specific restroom?

23 A. Not that I know, no.

24 Q. All right. Let's go back to talking about Dr. Tudor's  
25 work.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Now, you testified earlier that as department chair you  
2 were familiar with Dr. Tudor's work; is that correct?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Now, there's been testimony in this case that Dr. Rachel  
5 Tudor applied for tenure and promotion a couple of times.

6 Does that strike you as out of the ordinary?

7 A. No.

8 Q. So is it common for professors to sometimes have to apply  
9 a second time?

10 A. I don't know that I would say it's common, but it does  
11 occur that someone might apply twice or even three times.

12 Q. All right. I want to get into some exhibits here.

13 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, may I approach?

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) I'd like to direct our attention to  
16 Plaintiff's Exhibit 70, which is the first one there in that  
17 packet there, Dr. Mischo.

18 Does that exhibit look familiar to you?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And could you tell us what this is.

21 A. It is an e-mail recommending to the dean that Dr. Tudor  
22 be awarded tenure and promotion to associate professor.

23 Q. And did you send this e-mail?

24 A. Yes.

25 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, I'd like to move that

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Plaintiff's Exhibit 70 be entered into evidence.

2 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Admitted.

4 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Can you explain to the jury here today  
5 why you determined that Dr. Tudor should be awarded tenure and  
6 promoted to the rank of associate professor?

7 A. That would have come from several years of working with  
8 Dr. Tudor and then having looked through her portfolio,  
9 which -- basically the application for tenure and promotion,  
10 which I looked at. And I found that it was sufficient, that  
11 it merited the promotion and tenure.

12 Q. And did you find it was sufficient in all three  
13 categories that were to be evaluated?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. I'd like for you to turn to Exhibit 72 -- Plaintiff's  
16 Exhibit 72. I'm sorry.

17 Does Plaintiff's Exhibit 72 look familiar to you?

18 A. Yes. It's been a while, but this -- yeah, I do. This  
19 does look familiar.

20 Q. Okay. And can you tell us what that is.

21 A. This is a memo to Dr. Tudor from the dean, Scoufos, of  
22 arts and sciences recommending to deny tenure to Dr. Tudor and  
23 to give Dr. Tudor a one-year terminal appointment.

24 Q. And did you receive a copy of this letter at the time it  
25 was sent as well?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. I don't recall. I see my name cc'd at the bottom, so I  
2 imagine I did.

3 Q. So, typically, if you're cc'd on something and it's  
4 identified there in the normal course of business, you would  
5 have received that; correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, I'd like to move that  
8 Plaintiff's Exhibit 72 be entered into evidence, if not  
9 already.

10 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Admitted.

12 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Do you recall what you thought when you  
13 got a copy of this memo? I know it was a long time ago, so  
14 take your time.

15 A. I would have thought that this was extremely unusual --  
16 certainly unprecedented, in my experience -- to offer a  
17 one-year terminal position at the same time of denying tenure  
18 or promotion.

19 Q. Without any reasoning provided in that memo, did you have  
20 any knowledge as to why your department's recommendation for  
21 tenure should have been denied?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Was there anything about Dr. Tudor's reputation that  
24 might have come into play?

25 A. I don't think so.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Now, do you see the date on this memo?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And that was January 12th, 2010?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Did you agree with Dean Scoufos's recommendation here?

6 A. I don't know that it was my position to agree or disagree  
7 with it. Perhaps I don't understand the question.

8 Q. Okay. I'll withdraw.

9 Now, in that January 12th, 2010, memorandum we're looking  
10 at, it says, "Based on the available documentation."

11 Do you have any idea what that would have meant?

12 A. That would have meant the application portfolio or binder  
13 that would have been submitted as part of the application.

14 Q. When you reviewed that binder -- or portfolio, as you  
15 call it -- did you feel like there was anything missing from  
16 it?

17 A. No.

18 Q. I'd like to direct our attention now to the next exhibit  
19 in your packet there, which is Plaintiff's Exhibit 77.

20 Now, do you recognize that memorandum?

21 A. Yes, I've seen this before. I'm not sure that I got a  
22 copy of it at that time, but yes.

23 MS. NOVOTNY: May I get clarification from the  
24 Court? I'm sorry. I can't recall.

25 Had Plaintiff's Exhibit 77 been entered with a previous

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 witness?

2 THE COURT: No. It was identified but never  
3 offered.

4 MS. NOVOTNY: Okay.

5 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Now, just looking at that particular  
6 memorandum, is there anything about it that sticks out to you?

7 A. Yes. I would say in the next-to-last paragraph there is  
8 a statement from the vice president for academic affairs  
9 about -- it says, "There are no letters of recommendation from  
10 tenured faculty members in her department."

11 Q. Now, why does that stand out to you, Dr. Mischo?

12 A. That really was not a requirement, to get letters from  
13 one's own colleagues. And it's not really a procedure that we  
14 followed at that time.

15 And, in fact, I thought it was inappropriate that members  
16 of the tenure and promotion committee also write letters of  
17 recommendation.

18 So it was not unusual at all for faculty to apply to  
19 tenure and promotion without any letters of recommendation  
20 from within the department from their colleagues.

21 So that strikes me as strange.

22 The same paragraph, it says, "The single-sentence  
23 recommendations for promotion and tenure from the committee do  
24 not give it justification."

25 And what strikes me as odd about that is that, at that

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 point, the recommendation from that committee was supposed to  
2 be simply a one-sentence statement as opposed to a  
3 justification.

4 Q. Thank you.

5 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, if defendants don't  
6 object, I'd like to admit Plaintiff's Exhibit 77. It is a  
7 document created by them.

8 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Admitted.

10 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) And what is the date on this second  
11 memorandum?

12 A. January 12th, 2010.

13 Q. So that's the same date as the previous memorandum that  
14 just said that Dr. Tudor was being denied; correct?

15 A. Okay. Which other one? I'm sorry.

16 Q. The one we were looking at just before, Plaintiff's  
17 Exhibit 72. I'm sorry.

18 A. 72?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Okay. I'm sorry. We're looking at 72 and 77?

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. Okay. Yeah, I -- we're looking at 77 and 72; is that  
23 correct?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. I want to make sure I have --

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Yes, sir.

2 A. Okay.

3 I'm sorry. What was the question?

4 Q. Now I forgot the question.

5 MS. NOVOTNY: May I have the question read back?

6 THE COURT: No. Just ask another one.

7 MS. NOVOTNY: All right.

8 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Those were both dated the same date;  
9 correct?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. Now, you already discussed the disagreement with the  
12 assertion that Dr. Tudor would need faculty -- tenured faculty  
13 recommendation letters as part of that packet; correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And there's also an assertion in here that there's little  
16 documentation of service activity in Dr. Tudor's portfolio  
17 other than routine departmental assignments.

18 Is that something you would agree with?

19 A. Okay. This is --

20 Q. This short paragraph here.

21 A. The second paragraph --

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. -- of the body?

24 I recall that Dr. Tudor was involved in some Native  
25 American symposium events and organizing the conference. I

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 recall that.

2 Q. Was the Native American symposium at Southeastern a  
3 fairly big deal for the school?

4 A. I would say yes.

5 Q. So would it be pretty prestigious to be a part of that  
6 symposium?

7 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Let me phrase it another way.

10 How did you feel about the Native American symposium?

11 A. I thought it was a very good thing for Southeastern to  
12 have. It was a national conference, and we brought in some  
13 very well-respected and renowned Native American scholars and  
14 speakers.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 Okay. I'd like to now direct your attention to  
17 Plaintiff's Exhibit 76.

18 Do you recognize Plaintiff's Exhibit 76, Dr. Mischo?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And can you tell us what that document is?

21 A. I need to review it here, please.

22 Q. Sure.

23 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

24 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I need to review the  
25 e-mail.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 THE COURT: Oh.

2 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm not sure. What is the  
3 question?

4 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Do you recognize this document, and can  
5 you tell us what it is?

6 A. Yes. Dr. Tudor had looked through her portfolio and  
7 found that one of those letters from January 12th had been  
8 taken out and a different one put in under that same date.

9 Q. And those would have been the two memorandums we were  
10 just looking at on the screens; is that correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And did you -- did you draft part of this e-mail and  
13 receive the other part of this e-mail?

14 A. I'm sorry?

15 Q. You drafted the e-mail that's at the top of the exhibit;  
16 correct?

17 A. It says "from." Yes, I did.

18 Q. And you were the receiver of the e-mail from Dr. Tudor on  
19 the bottom of this exhibit?

20 A. Correct.

21 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, I'd like to ask that  
22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 76 be entered into evidence.

23 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Admitted.

25 MS. NOVOTNY: I'm not sure I can read that now.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) As we're looking at this e-mail exchange  
2 between yourself and Dr. Tudor, can you recall how you felt at  
3 the time that you drafted this e-mail?

4 A. Well, obviously, I think I would have been concerned that  
5 changes to the portfolio had been made, and apparently without  
6 any notification to the candidate or to the department chair,  
7 which -- I was not department chair at that time. I had  
8 resigned the year prior to this.

9 Q. Okay. And who was the department chair at the time?

10 A. Dr. Randy Prus.

11 Q. Is that the Randy that's mentioned in your e-mail here?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Now, did Dean Scoufos ever talk to you about why  
14 that letter was placed into Dr. Tudor's portfolio?

15 A. No.

16 Q. And this exchange between you and Dr. Tudor, this was in  
17 September of 2010, and the previous documents we were looking  
18 at were dated in January of 2010.

19 So this is -- this is nine months later; correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And so at no time, until September 14th or 15th of 2010,  
22 at that time you were not aware of the second memorandum that  
23 had a further explanation in there?

24 A. No. Once -- once the binder, the portfolio, is -- once  
25 it leaves my office, I do not see it again.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. After you saw the reasoning provided by Dean Scoufos in  
2 that second letter or memorandum, did you -- where Dean  
3 Scoufos was denying your and your department's recommendation  
4 of tenure and promotion, did you believe that Dr. Tudor was  
5 being treated similarly to other faculty members at  
6 Southeastern?

7 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. She's  
8 testifying for the witness and leading.

9 THE COURT: Overruled.  
10 You may answer.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can I have the question again,  
12 please?

13 MS. NOVOTNY: Sure. And I'll try to make it a  
14 little better that time.

15 I'm sorry. I'm a little nervous up here today, folks.  
16 It's been a little while since I've been in front of a jury.

17 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Now, after you saw the reasoning  
18 provided by Dean Scoufos for denying your department's  
19 recommendation and your recommendation of tenure and  
20 promotion, did you believe that Dr. Tudor was being treated  
21 similarly to other faculty members at Southeastern?

22 A. No.

23 Q. What stood out to you about how she was being treated  
24 differently?

25 A. In my experience there at Southeastern, there had never

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 been a tenure track faculty member that had been offered an  
2 eighth year or an extra year. The period of probation is  
3 seven years. And that is, as I understood it, absolute. So  
4 an extra or eighth year was very much, to my experience,  
5 unprecedented.

6 Q. Thank you.

7 I'd like to now direct your attention to Plaintiff's  
8 Exhibit 92, which is the last exhibit in that packet I handed  
9 you there.

10 Do you recognize Plaintiff's Exhibit 92?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And can you tell us what this is?

13 A. This would be a department chair's yearly or annual  
14 evaluation of Dr. Tudor as a faculty member.

15 Q. And did you participate in the creation of this  
16 evaluation?

17 A. Yes. This was mine.

18 Q. And is that your signature on the second page of the  
19 exhibit next to "Department Chair"?

20 A. Yes.

21 MS. NOVOTNY: Your Honor, I'd like to move that  
22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 92 be entered into evidence.

23 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Admitted.

25 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) I'll first direct you to the first page

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 of this document, and I'll make sure it's all on here for  
2 everybody.

3 Now, in this document here, it looks like it is set up in  
4 some different categories.

5 Can you explain what those categories are there?

6 A. The first is effective classroom teaching. Category  
7 No. 2 is scholarship or research. Category 3, service to  
8 institution, professional, and public. Category 4,  
9 performance of administrative duties, which did not apply to  
10 Dr. Tudor.

11 Q. Okay. And looking at the first category, then, effective  
12 classroom teaching, what was your conclusion about Dr. Tudor's  
13 performance for the 2008-2009 year?

14 A. I checked the "Commendable" box.

15 Q. Is there a comment there? Did you write that comment  
16 there as well?

17 A. It says, "Dedicated to developing online courses."

18 Q. Okay. And at the time of 2008-2009, was online courses  
19 something new that was being done at Southeastern?

20 A. I would say relatively new, yes.

21 Q. Was it helpful to have a professor willing to engage in  
22 something new and try to embark on that for the university?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, the second category there, scholarship, can you tell  
25 us what conclusions you came to about Dr. Tudor's scholarship?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. I checked "Outstanding" in that box.

2 Q. And you also had some comments; correct?

3 A. It says "Published article," and then in parentheses "in  
4 press," which means that it had been accepted but had not  
5 actually been printed, in print.

6 Q. Okay. And there's been some testimony in the case up to  
7 now that getting peer-reviewed scholarly articles published is  
8 something that's expected of somebody applying for tenure.

9 Does that sound accurate to you?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And do you know if Dr. Tudor had more than one article at  
12 that time?

13 A. I don't recall.

14 Q. Okay. Now, there's also a third box for service to  
15 institution.

16 Can you explain why you checked the "Commendable" box  
17 there?

18 A. I don't recall. It would have been based on another  
19 document which would have listed some of Dr. Tudor's service  
20 things, which I don't have in front of me, so I don't know  
21 exactly --

22 Q. Sure.

23 A. -- why.

24 That was my evaluation, that it was commendable. I don't  
25 recall on what specifically it was based.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. But do you generally agree that, had you  
2 checked -- you checked the "Commendable" box because you had  
3 reason to believe that she had been participating in service  
4 to the institution and her profession?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. I want to draw your attention to the second page of this  
7 document now, and this is the signature page here.

8 Now, it looks like your signature's here, and the date is  
9 11-20-2009.

10 Do you notice any other date on that page?

11 A. Next to the dean's signature, it -- I can't read --  
12 excuse me. I can't read it. It looks like 04-06-10.

13 Q. Does that date of April 6, 2010, stand out to you at all?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Well, do you recall a meeting that you attended with  
16 Dr. Tudor and Dean Scoufos on or around April 6th, 2010?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. This would have been a few months after the January memos  
19 we were looking at a few moments ago.

20 Can you explain generally what you recall of that meeting  
21 in April of 2010?

22 A. I think there may have been more than one meeting with  
23 Dr. Tudor and I and the dean, but the one I remember focused  
24 on the denial of tenure and promotion and the offering of the  
25 one-year terminal position.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Was there any other kind of offer made in that meeting?

2 A. I don't think so. I don't remember.

3 Q. Would it help to refresh your memory?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay.

6 MS. NOVOTNY: Ezra, can you pull Dr. Mischo's  
7 deposition? I don't remember the number now.

8 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Okay. Well, while he's looking for  
9 that -- now, at the time that the meeting of April 6, 2010,  
10 were you still department chair at that time?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And is that why you were accompanying Dr. Tudor to that  
13 meeting?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. Do you remember at any time in that meeting  
16 feeling like there was some kind of an ultimatum given to  
17 Dr. Tudor?

18 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

19 THE COURT: Overruled.

20 THE WITNESS: An ultimatum?

21 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Yes.

22 A. What I recall is that the dean made clear that  
23 Dr. Tudor's application for tenure and promotion would be  
24 denied and that Dr. Tudor should not go forward with it but  
25 instead would -- or should take the one-year position, that

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 either Dr. Tudor accepted the one-year position or she would  
2 not be given that extra year.

3 Q. So you would not describe that meeting as Dr. Tudor being  
4 given a generous offer by Southeastern?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Okay. Now, did this discussion of Dr. Tudor being asked  
7 to withdraw and take the one-year terminal appointment, was  
8 that ever put in writing to Dr. Tudor at that meeting?

9 A. Not at the meeting. I don't recall anything in writing.

10 Q. Does that seem strange for something that would be --  
11 that Southeastern would describe as a generous offer, that  
12 they wouldn't be willing to put that in writing?

13 A. Is it strange?

14 Q. Yes.

15 A. Yes. I would say that's unusual.

16 Q. Thank you.

17 Now, you mentioned earlier that you're no longer the  
18 chair of the English, Humanities, and Language department at  
19 Southeastern?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. I might go back just a second. I'm going to withdraw  
22 that last question.

23 You'd previously testified at a deposition for this case;  
24 is that correct?

25 A. Correct.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Do you recall at that deposition testifying that the  
2 administrators didn't have the power to give such an offer?

3 A. I don't recall testifying to that. It sounds like  
4 something I would have said.

5 Q. So you don't dispute that that was your testimony at that  
6 time?

7 A. If it's in the deposition, I don't dispute it, no.

8 Q. Okay. Let's go back to -- now, you stepped down as chair  
9 of the English, Humanities, and Language department at  
10 Southeastern.

11 When was that?

12 A. That would have been after the spring of 2010, spring  
13 semester.

14 Q. Okay. And was there a reason that you stepped down?

15 A. There were several reasons.

16 Q. Can you explain to the jury here today what your  
17 reasonings for stepping down as chair were?

18 A. I had been department chair for seven years, and one  
19 thing, I wanted to return to full-time teaching. And I was  
20 not, at that point, really interested in continuing with all  
21 of the administrative -- with the administrative duties that  
22 came with being department chair.

23 Q. Okay. Do you recall anything else that led you to step  
24 down as chair?

25 A. The morale of the faculty was quite low at that point,

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 and I think we had -- at the university level, we had an  
2 atmosphere which was not very pleasant or something I wanted  
3 to continue dealing with.

4 Q. Do you remember describing it as a lack of shared  
5 governance?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And what do you mean by "a lack of shared governance"?

8 A. A lack of shared governance would be something where  
9 administration and faculty are not working together. I would  
10 say where administration makes decisions without notifying  
11 or -- without notifying the faculty or justifying decisions.

12 Q. And is shared governance something that's important to an  
13 institution such as Southeastern, in your opinion?

14 A. I think it is. I think it is valuable, yes.

15 Q. And do you recall also describing a lack of transparency  
16 as well?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And can you explain why you felt there was a lack of  
19 transparency?

20 A. Going back to the exhibits, I would look to the letter or  
21 memo from Dean Scoufos which denied tenure and promotion  
22 without any justification as to why. To me, that would be not  
23 being transparent.

24 Q. So this particular memorandum?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Did the administration's treatment of the Dr. Tudor  
2 matter, in regards to her tenure and promotion, have anything  
3 to do with you stepping down as chair?

4 A. I would say yes. It was one of several things that  
5 pretty much persuaded me that I was no longer interested in  
6 any sort of administrative -- administrative role, and, again,  
7 wanting to get back to full-time teaching.

8 Q. Sure.

9 Now, did being a department chair come with a pay raise?

10 A. A small one, yes.

11 Q. Did stepping down from that role mean you had to give up  
12 that small pay raise?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And so, because of a lack of shared governance, a lack of  
15 transparency, and how Dr. Tudor was treated by the  
16 administration, you voluntarily took a pay cut; is that  
17 correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. All right. One more question before I hand you over.

20 Let's go back to that meeting we discussed earlier, the  
21 one in 2007 concerning specific instruction for Dr. Tudor  
22 regarding bathroom usage.

23 Looking back at that meeting, with all the context now  
24 that you have of the kind of work that Dr. Tudor did after  
25 bravely facing her colleagues as the woman she is, do you

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 think that Dr. Tudor was just never going to get a fair shake  
2 from the administration at Southeastern?

3 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
4 speculation.

5 THE COURT: Overruled.

6 THE WITNESS: Okay. Could you repeat the question?

7 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Sure.

8 So going back to that meeting that we were discussing  
9 earlier, the meeting about the bathroom rules that were  
10 specifically applied to Dr. Tudor, with all the context you  
11 now have looking back at all those years and the kind of work  
12 that Dr. Tudor did and bravely facing her colleagues as the  
13 woman who she is, do you think that Dr. Tudor was just never  
14 going to get a fair shake from the administration at  
15 Southeastern?

16 A. At that time, I did not know. I could not say.

17 MS. NOVOTNY: Okay. Thank you. I will pass you off  
18 to the State.

19 THE COURT: Mr. Bunson.

20 MR. BUNSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

22 BY MR. BUNSON:

23 Q. Good morning, Dr. Mischo.

24 A. Good morning.

25 Q. I'd like to start with the meeting that you just

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 referenced, the 2007 meeting regarding Dr. Tudor's transition.

2 Do you recall that?

3 A. This is the one about the bathroom, using the bathrooms?

4 Q. Yes, sir.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And in your testimony you indicated that it was  
7 determined that Dr. Tudor would use the unisex restroom; is  
8 that correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Were you part of that determination?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Do you know who made that determination?

13 A. I do not know.

14 Q. Do you know whether or not Dr. Tudor was offered the  
15 privacy of a single-occupant restroom as a courtesy?

16 A. I don't know.

17 Q. Dr. Mischo, if you would, refer back to Exhibit 70,  
18 Plaintiff's Exhibit 70.

19 A. Okay. I'm sorry. 70?

20 Q. Yes, sir.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. And you recall that was the e-mail from you to  
23 Dr. Tudor --

24 A. Right.

25 Q. -- recommending her for tenure and promotion; correct?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Right.

2 Q. Do you have your reasoning in there as to why you  
3 recommend her for tenure and promotion?

4 A. No.

5 Q. And you talked earlier about transparency being  
6 important.

7 Do you recall that testimony?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And you see that there is no reasoning in there as well;  
10 is that correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Would that also be considered, at least on some level, a  
13 lack of transparency?

14 A. I think the function of this letter was to -- was to  
15 notify the candidate, not so much to justify or explain.

16 Q. Did you ever give her an explanation as to why you  
17 recommended her for tenure and promotion?

18 A. There was a form, as part of the application that I  
19 filled out, which would have involved some checking of boxes.  
20 But other than that, I think that was it in terms of  
21 explanation to Dr. Tudor.

22 Q. Thank you, Dr. Mischo.

23 Is it fair to say that, during your time of Dr. Tudor's  
24 tenure and promotion process as well as during your time as  
25 department chair, that you disliked the role of administration

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 in that process?

2 A. Certainly some days I disliked administration. Not every  
3 day, but, yes, there was --

4 Q. And if you had your way, you'd rather have a department  
5 that was run by faculty rather than a chair or an  
6 administration, wouldn't you?

7 A. The -- yeah. My sort of thinking is that a department  
8 chair is not a head or boss but rather sort of a coordinator  
9 and that it should be the faculty, rather than an individual,  
10 making important decisions.

11 Q. Do you recall how tenure and promotion committees were  
12 formed at Southeastern? And if so, how is it formed?

13 A. At this point in time or back in the time we're looking  
14 at, the tenure and promotion committees would be five tenured  
15 faculty at associate or full-professor level.

16 Q. And, Dr. Mischo, do you make the selection of those five  
17 individuals?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Does anybody else give you feedback about those five  
20 individuals?

21 A. I can't remember, but I think the list of the tenure and  
22 promotion committee might have gone to the dean. I'm not  
23 certain of that, though.

24 Q. But you were the one who selects those five people;  
25 correct?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Correct.

2 MR. BUNSON: May I approach, Your Honor?

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Dr. Mischo, do you recognize that  
5 document?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What is that document, Doctor?

8 A. The first e-mail to Dr. Tudor is a notification of the  
9 constitution of her tenure and promotion.

10 MR. BUNSON: At this time, Your Honor, I'd move for  
11 Defendant's Exhibit 199 to be admitted.

12 THE COURT: Any objection?

13 MS. NOVOTNY: No objection.

14 THE COURT: It will be admitted.

15 MR. BUNSON: Thank you.

16 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Now, Dr. Mischo, with that document  
17 specifically, do you recall who you appointed to Dr. Tudor's  
18 2009 tenure and promotion committee?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Who are they?

21 A. Dr. Coleman, the committee chair; Dr. Prus; Dr. Allen;  
22 Dr. Spencer; Dr. Parrish.

23 Q. And if you could, Dr. Mischo, again, in the e-mail that  
24 you're writing to Dr. Tudor, you say that "I have appointed  
25 your tenure and promotion committee." Correct?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Did anyone influence who you put in any of those  
3 positions?

4 A. I'm sorry. Could I have the question again?

5 Q. I'll ask it differently.

6 You are the one who made that determination; correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Did anyone tell you to put any one of those five members  
9 on that committee?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Did anyone tell you who to put as the chair of that  
12 committee?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 Just taking a quick step back. Do you recall  
16 specifically who you appointed to Dr. Tudor's 2008 tenure and  
17 promotion committee?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Thank you.

20 And in that same exhibit, do you see that Dr. Tudor has  
21 objected to Dr. Coleman serving as chair of her committee?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. And that's because Dr. Tudor accused Dr. Coleman of  
24 discrimination; isn't that correct?

25 A. I know Dr. Tudor objected to Dr. Coleman. I'm not -- I

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 don't quite recall why.

2 Q. So you don't recall Dr. Tudor ever accusing Dr. Coleman  
3 of discrimination?

4 A. Maybe not in those terms. I don't recall, but I know  
5 Dr. Tudor did not think Dr. Coleman -- from this e-mail and I  
6 think subsequent discussion I think I had with Dr. Tudor, did  
7 not think Dr. Coleman would be good or fair in that position.

8 Q. But you left Dr. Coleman on her committee; correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Did you communicate your reasonings for leaving  
11 Dr. Coleman on Dr. Tudor's tenure and promotion committee to  
12 Dr. Tudor herself?

13 A. I told Dr. Tudor that, in my opinion, that I thought  
14 Dr. Coleman would be capable of being objective and being a  
15 fair committee chair. I recall discussing that in person.

16 Q. Thank you, Doctor.

17 Would you agree that the process of evaluating tenure and  
18 portfolio promotions -- let me strike that question.

19 Would you agree that the process of evaluating tenure and  
20 promotion portfolios and each of the criteria within them is  
21 inherently subjective?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And when judging scholarship, people can view the same  
24 act, same piece of evidence, and view it differently; is that  
25 correct?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Can professionals have differing views but still be  
3 respectful?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And two people can look at the same portfolio and come to  
6 completely different conclusions, can't they?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. When it comes to the area of scholarship, at the time you  
9 were evaluating the portfolio, what was more important,  
10 quantity or quality?

11 A. In terms of scholarship?

12 Q. Yes, sir.

13 A. If I had to say, I would say they both mattered, but  
14 certainly quantity in the sense of, I think, one or two  
15 publications would be -- would be, to me, necessary; 1.5  
16 maybe.

17 At an institution like ours, the quality of the journal  
18 doesn't matter as much as it would at a research institution.  
19 So I think it would be fair to say that I would look at it  
20 certainly in terms of both quality and quantity, but  
21 definitely there had to be kind of a minimal kind of output of  
22 scholarship articles.

23 Q. Dr. Mischo, you were asked earlier if you recall giving a  
24 deposition in this case on May 5th, 2016.

25 Do you recall that?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 MR. BUNSON: May I approach, Your Honor?

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 MR. BUNSON: Page 66, lines 11 through 16.

5 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Doctor, would you please turn to page 66.

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Just to yourself and not out loud, please read lines 11  
8 through 16.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. In that, didn't you testify that at the time, when you  
11 were asked whether or not quantity or quality was more  
12 important, your singular answer was "quantity"?

13 A. Okay. I think just prior to this we were talking about  
14 scholarship. I think I might not -- are we talking about --  
15 this refers to service --

16 Q. My apologies.

17 A. -- as to quantity.

18 Q. You're correct.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. If you could, then, please turn to page 81.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. And to yourself, please read lines 3 through 7.

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. Earlier you testified that one or two articles, maybe one  
25 and a half publications, was enough.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Do you recall that testimony?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. After reading that, does that refresh your recollection  
4 as to how much you insisted or --

5 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection, Your Honor. He already  
6 testified to the one and a half without needing the  
7 deposition.

8 THE COURT: I don't know if you're impeaching or  
9 refreshing his recollection. Either read it or let him read  
10 it and then ask him the question.

11 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Dr. Mischo, will you please -- in your  
12 deposition, if you could follow along starting at Line 3, you  
13 were asked:

14 "Question: And what would you normally tell professors  
15 about the type of scholarship they would have to get tenure?

16 Answer: Typically, I would say you would need one and a  
17 half publications."

18 Is that correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. Duplicative.

21 THE COURT: Sustained.

22 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Dr. Mischo, do you recall talking to  
23 Dr. Tudor about her opinion that she needed at least one and a  
24 half publications in her portfolio?

25 A. Did I talk to Dr. Tudor about that?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Yes.

2 A. We would have, as a course of procedure with every  
3 untenured faculty member, the department chair, I would meet  
4 with each one of them at the beginning of each academic year,  
5 and we would go over their plan -- their development plan,  
6 what they were going to do for that year. And we would talk  
7 about in terms of where are you in terms of the three  
8 categories moving toward tenure?

9 So we would have talked about, again, service --  
10 teaching, research, and service.

11 Q. And at that meeting you would have instructed her that it  
12 was your recommendation that at least one and a half  
13 publications be in her portfolio; is that correct?

14 A. That was --

15 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. Asked and answered.

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

17 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Did you have that meeting with Dr. Tudor  
18 before she applied for tenure in 2008?

19 A. The yearly meeting, I don't recall if it was before or  
20 after the portfolio was submitted.

21 Q. Well, you have an annual review with her every year; is  
22 that correct?

23 A. Well, we have a meeting at the beginning of the academic  
24 year in August or September. And then the evaluation is done  
25 at the end of the semester, sometime in April or at the end of

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 the academic year in April. So there would be beginning and  
2 ending discussions.

3 Q. Doctor, do you know how many publications Dr. Tudor had  
4 in her 2008 portfolio?

5 A. I don't remember.

6 Q. Do you remember reviewing that portfolio?

7 A. I -- it's been a while. I don't recall. I know I looked  
8 through it, of course, but I don't recall the details.

9 Q. Do you know how many publications Dr. Tudor had in her  
10 2009 portfolio?

11 A. No, I don't remember.

12 Q. But you recall looking at that portfolio too; correct?

13 A. I must have. I don't remember, again, looking at it.  
14 There were, again -- there was more than one, so...

15 Q. Earlier, you were asked to review the evaluation of  
16 Dr. Tudor.

17 Do you recall that?

18 A. The annual?

19 Q. Yes, sir. It's Plaintiff's Exhibit 92, if you'd like to  
20 look at it.

21 A. Right.

22 Q. And under "publication" it says "published article"; is  
23 that correct?

24 A. Right.

25 Q. That would imply it was one article; correct?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. One article at that point which was scheduled, right. It  
2 was in press. It was accepted to be published.

3 Q. So, at that time, if you had known that Dr. Tudor had  
4 more articles, you would have implied "articles," wouldn't  
5 you?

6 A. I think what the -- the comment that says "published  
7 article" would refer to this academic year. So what that  
8 would refer to would be during this time period, '08-'09, that  
9 there would have been one published.

10 Now, I don't recall if there were others before or not.

11 Q. And if Dr. Tudor submitted a 2008 portfolio with zero  
12 publications in it, that would not be following your  
13 recommendation of at least one and a half; is that correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. If she had submitted a 2009 portfolio with only one  
16 article, that would still not be following your minimum of at  
17 least one and a half publications; is that correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. And yet you recommended Dr. Tudor for tenure even though  
20 she didn't meet your own criteria for publications necessary  
21 for tenure; is that correct?

22 A. I think there may have been -- again, we get into that  
23 issue of one and a half articles.

24 The one and a half, you can't publish a half an article.  
25 So what the one-half would have referred to would have been

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 maybe something else, maybe a book review or something which  
2 was not an article, but it was a kind of publication if not an  
3 article per se.

4 Q. But if she had one, that would still be less than one and  
5 a half, per your recommendation; correct?

6 A. Right.

7 Q. Dr. Mischo, do you recall a meeting you had with  
8 Dr. Tudor in 2009 where you informed Dr. Tudor that you didn't  
9 think she was on track for tenure because she was lacking in  
10 both the areas of research and scholarship?

11 A. Once again, please.

12 Q. Do you recall a meeting you had with Dr. Tudor in 2009  
13 where you informed her that you didn't think she was on track  
14 for tenure because she was lacking in both the areas of  
15 research and scholarship?

16 A. I can't remember that.

17 Q. Doctor, if you could turn to your deposition, page 136,  
18 lines 4 through 22.

19 A. Okay.

20 Q. In that, you were asked specifically, "Did you ever tell  
21 Dr. Tudor that you did not think she was going -- or she was  
22 doing what she needed to do to become qualified for tenure?"

23 The answer you said was, "I think I did, yes."

24 A. Okay, yeah. At some point I would have in that five-year  
25 period. I think earlier in the five-year period, I had

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 discussed with Dr. Tudor the necessity by the end of the  
2 five-year period to again have something.

3 Q. And at this time, you were asked, "What did you tell  
4 Dr. Tudor she was not doing that she needed to do to become  
5 qualified for tenure?"

6 And your answer was, "It would have been -- it would have  
7 involved the research or scholarship."

8 Is that correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. As the chair of the department, Dr. Mischo, do you review  
11 the full portfolios of every candidate for tenure and  
12 promotion?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Can you please turn to page 156 of your deposition,  
15 please, lines 3 through 7.

16 You were asked, "Did you typically read the entire  
17 portfolio of applicants for promotion and tenure?"

18 Did I read that question correctly?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Your answer was, "No, not if they included a syllabus or  
21 something like that. I'm not going to read all of those, no.  
22 Scanned through them."

23 Is that accurate?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. So you didn't necessarily review every portfolio for

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 tenure and promotion; is that correct?

2 A. I reviewed every portfolio but not every page, no.

3 Q. Thank you for that clarification.

4 THE COURT: Let me stop you here, and we will take  
5 our morning recess.

6 Don't discuss the case or permit others to discuss it  
7 with you. Be back in the jury deliberation room at eleven  
8 o'clock, and we'll be in recess.

9 (In recess from 10:40 a.m. to 11:05 a.m.)

10 (The following proceedings were had out of the presence  
11 of the jury with all parties present.)

12 THE COURT: Be seated.

13 Ms. Coffey, Linda has told me what you want to raise. I  
14 never gave any instructions in the courtroom because there  
15 weren't any witnesses here.

16 Let me instruct all of you, had there been witnesses  
17 present in the courtroom, my instruction to them would have  
18 been, do not discuss your testimony with anyone except the  
19 lawyers present in the courtroom today and make no attempt to  
20 listen to or discover what any other witness testified to.

21 Now, I believe you can follow that instruction still  
22 meeting in the same place with your witnesses or relaxing in  
23 the same -- whatever you're doing down there, and you're  
24 permitted to talk -- you-all are permitted to talk to the  
25 witnesses. They just can't talk to each other.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 So observe that order, please.

2 Anything else?

3 MS. COFFEY: No.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Bring the jury in.

5 (Jury enters.)

6 THE COURT: Be seated, please.

7 Please continue.

8 Q (BY MR. BUNSON) Dr. Mischo, we're almost done, but I  
9 just have a few things that I need to clarify if you don't  
10 mind.

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. Earlier, you testified that the offer from the  
13 administration, from Dean Scoufos, for the eighth year of  
14 tenure track was unusual; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And it's unusual because typical tenure track is seven  
17 years; correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. So the offer to obtain an eighth year -- sorry. The  
20 offer for an eighth year to obtain tenure is what you felt was  
21 unusual; is that correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Dr. Mischo, as department chair, did Dr. Tudor ever  
24 complain to you about any restrictions placed on her?

25 A. Not that I remember, no.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. No complaints of bathroom restrictions; is that correct?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. No complaints of makeup restrictions; is that correct?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. No restrictions of dress code restrictions; is that  
6 correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And absolutely no complaint she was being mistreated  
9 because she was transgender; is that correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Did you ever personally observe anyone criticizing the  
12 way Dr. Tudor dressed?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Did you ever personally observe anyone criticizing  
15 Dr. Tudor's makeup?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did you ever personally observe anyone complaining about  
18 which restroom Dr. Tudor used?

19 A. No.

20 Q. And if you had personally witnessed any of that  
21 discrimination towards Dr. Tudor or had Dr. Tudor reported it  
22 to you, you would have reported it; correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 MR. BUNSON: Thank you. No further questions.

25 THE COURT: Redirect?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

**REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

BY MS. NOVOTNY:

Q. Thank you, Dr. Mischo.

When you were talking to Attorney Bunson from the AG's office a moment ago, he asked about whether the unisex restroom for Dr. Tudor was being provided as a courtesy.

Now -- just a second. I lost my note. Sorry. Did Dr. Tudor have any say in which restroom she could use?

A. I don't think --

MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: You may answer if you know.

THE WITNESS: I don't think so.

Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) And at that 2007 meeting, it was not indicated that she had been given a say in that; is that correct?

A. I didn't get the impression that Dr. Tudor had a say in that, no.

Q. Okay. Now, another thing that you were being asked about on cross-examination is, you know, whether Dr. Tudor had done enough to earn tenure in 2008.

I don't think, you know, anybody is disputing it, but is it possible for someone to have not earned tenure in 2008 but corrected deficiencies in areas they may have been lacking in so that they were qualified to earn tenure by 2009?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes. There is the five- to seven-year probation period.  
2 So one can apply for tenure fifth, sixth, and seventh year and  
3 improve if necessary.

4 Q. Okay. And did Dr. Tudor publish articles between the  
5 2008 application and the 2009 application for tenure?

6 A. I can't remember.

7 Q. Fair enough.

8 And is it possible that she did?

9 A. Pardon?

10 Q. Is it possible she did based on you looking at the  
11 exhibit earlier of her '08-'09 review?

12 A. Yes. I know she did publish some after I resigned as  
13 department chair, which I did -- which I did not know of as  
14 chair.

15 Q. Now, there was also some testimony on cross-examination.  
16 You indicated that Dr. Coleman was on Dr. Tudor's committee  
17 for tenure.

18 Now, did Dr. Coleman's tenure committee end up  
19 recommending Dr. Tudor for tenure?

20 A. I can't remember which -- which year was this? I get the  
21 years mixed up.

22 Q. Sure.

23 I believe it was the Defendant's Exhibit 199.

24 MS. NOVOTNY: I'm sorry, Tim. I thought we'd be  
25 done with your exhibits.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. BUNSON: I'm happy to provide them.

2 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Does this document refresh your memory a  
3 little bit?

4 A. Okay. Yes.

5 Q. Was this the committee that ultimately determined that  
6 Rachel Tudor had earned tenure?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Thank you.

9 Also, on cross-examination, there seemed to be some  
10 discussion about tenure being inherently subjective.

11 When you say "subjective," do you mean arbitrary or do  
12 you mean that in a different way?

13 A. No, I don't mean subjective in the sense of arbitrary,  
14 no, no.

15 There are -- it's subjective, but the subjective  
16 judgments are based on some standards that are -- that we do  
17 have in our policy and procedure manual.

18 Q. If Dr. Tudor were to be awarded a return to Southeastern  
19 University, would you welcome her back?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you feel like she did earn the tenure and deserves the  
22 tenure she earned?

23 A. I recommended that, yes.

24 MS. NOVOTNY: Okay. Nothing further.

25 THE COURT: Redirect -- I mean, recross?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. BUNSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Very brief.

2 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION**

3 BY MR. BUNSON:

4 Q. Dr. Mischo, you just testified on redirect that the  
5 policy states that a candidate can apply in their fifth,  
6 sixth, and seventh year; is that correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Now, if the policy were to say "fifth, sixth, or seventh  
9 year," that would be different, wouldn't it?

10 A. Yes.

11 MR. BUNSON: Thank you. No further questions.

12 THE COURT: You may step down.

13 (Witness excused.)

14 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

15 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, Dr. Tudor's calling Dr. Mark  
16 Spencer. Co-counsel is running to our witness room to go grab  
17 Dr. Spencer.

18 THE COURT: Stand and stretch if you need it.

19 MR. YOUNG: Sorry, Your Honor. They're talking  
20 about literature. It's herding cats.

21 THE COURT: Please step right up here next to the  
22 witness stand -- right up here -- and then face the clerk and  
23 be sworn.

24 (Witness duly sworn.)

25 THE COURT: Be seated.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 WHEREUPON, MARK SPENCER, Ph.D., after having been first  
2 duly sworn, testifies in reply to the questions propounded as  
3 follows:

4 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

5 BY MR. YOUNG:

6 Q. Good morning again, Dr. Spencer.

7 You told me before we came in that you're a little hard  
8 of hearing. So if you can't hear me, let me know. Okay?  
9 Because I want to make sure that you hear me. And do the same  
10 for the lawyers at the attorney general's office.

11 So, Dr. Spencer, do you work at Southeastern?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. What is your job title?

14 A. Professor of English and Humanities.

15 Q. Do you have tenure?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. If you could slow down a little bit because the court  
18 reporter needs to transcribe what we're saying. It's easier  
19 if it's a little bit slower.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. When did you start working at Southeastern?

22 A. 2001. August 2001.

23 Q. And have you worked at Southeastern from 2001 to present?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Okay. What department do you work in?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. The department of English, Humanities, and Languages.

2 Q. Have you been in the English department the whole time?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. So, Dr. Spencer, I want to talk a little bit with  
5 you about your own experience applying for tenure.

6 Do you recall what year you applied for tenure?

7 A. I guess it would have been 2006.

8 Q. Do you recall how your department promotion and tenure  
9 committee voted on your application?

10 A. Yes. They voted -- it was a bit of a split vote. They  
11 voted for tenure but not promotion to assistant professor.

12 Q. Do you know what the vote was at the next level in the  
13 process? Do you know who would -- let me withdraw that  
14 question.

15 What person or entity voted on the application after the  
16 promotion and tenure committee?

17 A. Who did it go to next?

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. Department chair, John Mischo.

20 Q. Do you recall what Dr. Mischo's vote was on your  
21 application?

22 A. He concurred with the faculty committee.

23 Q. Okay. And we're just going to go through all the stages.

24 A. Sure.

25 Q. Okay. Who does the application go to after the

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 department chair?

2 A. It goes to C.W. Mangrum, who was dean of arts and  
3 sciences.

4 Q. And do you recall what Dean Mangrum's decision was on  
5 your application?

6 A. Yes. He was for both tenure and promotion to associate  
7 professor from assistant.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. I may have misspoke and said assistant before. You start  
10 out as assistant, then you're promoted to associate.

11 Q. Can you explain to the jury, is it typical that someone  
12 applies for both tenure and promotion at the same time?

13 A. Right, normally. That was an unusual move for the  
14 committee to do on my part, to split them.

15 Q. Okay. So after the dean, who does it go to?

16 A. The academic vice president, who would have been Doug  
17 McMillan at the time.

18 Q. Okay. So I want to ask you some questions about your  
19 experiences with Doug McMillan and this tenure application in  
20 particular.

21 So what was Doug McMillan's decision?

22 A. It was negative on both, neither tenure nor promotion.

23 Q. Was that surprising to you? Was that surprising to you?

24 A. I'm still not quite understanding what you're saying.

25 Q. I'm sorry.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Was that Dr. McMillan's decision on your application  
2 surprising to you?

3 A. Oh, yes. Actually, the faculty one was surprising too.  
4 So that was very surprise -- a shock, in fact. I mean...

5 Q. Once you found out about Doug McMillan's decision on your  
6 application, did you do anything to try to get more  
7 information?

8 A. I spoke to John Mischo, who was the chair, a little bit.  
9 And, at that time, there was not any requirement to provide a  
10 written explanation, so I only got, oh, a little bit -- I  
11 think it was, like, lack of collegiality or something, and  
12 then later it was something to the effect of minimal  
13 publications were the problem.

14 Then that's when I decided on my own to intervene in the  
15 process.

16 Q. Was it because tenure is important?

17 A. Oh, yeah. I mean, your future at the school hangs on it.  
18 You either get tenure or you're out in a tenure-track  
19 situation.

20 Q. Okay. So why don't we talk a little bit about what you  
21 did to try to intervene.

22 A. Right.

23 Q. Who did you try to talk to after John Mischo?

24 A. Well, I decided to start at the bottom, basically, with  
25 John Mischo, the chair, going over it. And then I went to

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 talk to C.W. Mangrum. And then I went to talk to Doug  
2 McMillan.

3 And then I asked Doug McMillan -- I planned all along to  
4 basically go over his ahead essentially to Snowden. And I  
5 asked him at that meeting if it was -- if he minded if I went  
6 on to Snowden as well.

7 So that was my -- my intention from the beginning was  
8 basically to start an appeal all the way in the process.

9 Q. Appeal all the steps of the way because it was important?

10 You decided early on in the process that you would appeal  
11 it all the way up because getting tenure is important?

12 A. Oh, certainly. Sure.

13 Q. Okay. So you talked to the dean, you talked to the vice  
14 president for academic affairs. And, eventually, you talked  
15 to -- I think you said Jesse Snowden was the president at the  
16 time?

17 A. No. It was -- Jesse Snowden was acting president.

18 Q. Jesse Snowden held the position of president or fill-in  
19 president for a while; right?

20 A. Jesse Snowden was.

21 Q. Okay. Did the dean, the vice president, and the  
22 president, they were all open to talking to you about your  
23 application even though a final decision hadn't been made?

24 A. Oh, yeah. Yeah.

25 Q. Was there any hesitancy?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. No, none. I didn't encounter any. I simply -- at each  
2 stage, you know, I would talk to the secretary, requested an  
3 appointment, and it was given to me.

4 Q. And that was the same for Vice President McMillan and  
5 Jesse Snowden?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about your  
8 conversations with Interim President Snowden. Okay?

9 So you spoke with him; right?

10 A. Uh-huh. Yes.

11 Q. In person?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. What did you speak about? What did you tell him?

14 A. I basically said that Doug McMillan had turned me down on  
15 both cases, and I didn't really agree with that decision, you  
16 know, because I wanted to find out reasons why.

17 Because, as I say, at that time -- you know, currently,  
18 they're expected to give a written assessment, where at that  
19 time they were not.

20 And so, you know, basically I was looking for an  
21 explanation. And then I was going to press my case if -- you  
22 know, depending on what he said.

23 Q. Did you feel like you had a right to try to make a case  
24 for yourself?

25 A. Yes. Yeah.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1       You know, especially -- I mean, tenure is such a critical  
2 point in an academic career, that a person's -- you know, the  
3 rest of their career is on the line. And so they definitely  
4 should get feedback on it.

5       As I say, at that time there was not even a written  
6 statement. You know, Doug McMillan's letter was just, like,  
7 one line, "I do not" -- in capital letters -- "recommend  
8 tenure, and I do not" -- capital letters -- "recommend  
9 promotion."

10      Q.    So did you talk to interim president Snowden about your  
11 qualifications in the area of scholarship and research?

12      A.    Right.

13      Q.    So can you just tell me generally what you talked about?

14      A.    Well, it was based on what I said to -- Doug McMillan's  
15 response to me was to send a few --

16           MR. BUNSON:  Objection, Your Honor.  Hearsay.

17           THE WITNESS:  Pardon?

18           THE COURT:  Do you have an argument this falls  
19 outside the hearsay rule?

20           MR. YOUNG:  I do not, Your Honor.

21           THE COURT:  All right.

22           Don't testify as to what someone told you, only what you  
23 did or said.

24           THE WITNESS:  Even in an interview with that person?

25           THE COURT:  Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.

2 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) It's odd. I'm sorry.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. Just, as we're going forward, you're one of the few who  
5 hasn't been questioned before. When there's an objection,  
6 just wait until the judge tells you --

7 A. Okay.

8 Well, that was -- the whole pitch of my conversation to  
9 Jesse was that this is what Doug said.

10 Q. Uh-huh.

11 A. And I had a -- so I had a remedy in which I had articles  
12 in my second dissertation that I could send out. So I  
13 basically -- from the beginning, my intention with Jesse  
14 Snowden was to tell him that why don't I just send these out  
15 now? You know, rather than waiting another year and  
16 reapplying, I could have them out in a matter of weeks, you  
17 know. And I did, and a couple of them were accepted.

18 So he agreed with that, and he said he would have to talk  
19 it over with Doug, basically, that would be okay with him, and  
20 for me to give him a list of the articles I had sent out. He  
21 said that he didn't have to send on a decision to the regents  
22 until about June 1st or something. So this was in March. So  
23 there was a couple of months.

24 So I sent the articles out and compiled a list and sent  
25 in -- sent it to him, and then he okayed the recommended

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 tenure and promotion, also based -- partly based on the dean's  
2 judgment is another reason why he was recommending both, in  
3 addition to, you know, my proposal to send the articles out.

4 Q. Okay. So in your situation, it was possible, once you  
5 got feedback from Interim President Snowden, to fix something  
6 within a few months' time?

7 A. Right. To send articles, right. He said there was --  
8 this was in March or so, I believe, and he said he didn't have  
9 to send the decision on --

10 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay again.

11 THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure who the speaker even  
12 is, but move on.

13 MR. YOUNG: I will.

14 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) So I know this was a long time ago, but do  
15 you remember how many articles you had in your portfolio  
16 before all these conversations with those administrators?

17 A. Yeah. I had a full published article, and I had a short  
18 conference -- I mean, excuse me -- a short -- it's called  
19 explicator. It's a little short article explicating a small  
20 point. And I had conference papers I had delivered, and I had  
21 proceedings from the Native American Symposium that I was the  
22 principal editor for.

23 So I felt that was a sufficient body of scholarship  
24 there, basically.

25 Q. But when you were told that wasn't a sufficient body of

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 scholarship, you wanted to fix it; is that right?

2 A. Well, I was under the understanding that was enough. In  
3 other words, that's why it was a bit of surprise to me, all  
4 this, you know, in terms of what the expectations were.

5 Then if I had known that I needed more articles, I would  
6 have sent those out earlier because I basically had them ready  
7 in my second dissertation.

8 Q. Okay.

9 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Dr. Spencer, do you recognize the exhibit  
12 that's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 48?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Can you tell me what it is?

15 A. It's the letter telling me -- informing me that he's  
16 recommending my tenure and promotion.

17 MR. YOUNG: I'd like to move to enter Plaintiff's  
18 Exhibit 48 into evidence.

19 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Admitted.

21 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) So in your case -- then we'll move on from  
22 this -- despite the vice president voting against you, you  
23 were able to get tenure because you were able to fix things  
24 before your application went to the interim president; is that  
25 right?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Right, yeah. It was before he was required to give a  
2 decision. I know what the time line was, so I went to see him  
3 before his decision would...

4 Q. So let's move on and let's talk a little bit about  
5 Dr. Tudor. Okay?

6 So you used to work with Dr. Tudor; right?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. Okay. Are you aware that Dr. Tudor applied for tenure in  
9 the 2009-2010 cycle?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Did you serve on Dr. Tudor's promotion and tenure  
12 committee that year?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you recall reviewing her tenure portfolio?

15 A. Recall reviewing it? Yes.

16 Q. Is there anything that sticks out in your mind about it?  
17 Was it a typical portfolio for the department?

18 A. This was the second time, right, in 2009? Right?

19 Q. Right.

20 A. The letter was-- the letter of application was  
21 unprofessionally written. I mean, it basically did not -- I  
22 mean, my heart sort of sank when I first read it. It was  
23 like, this is not the way you present a letter --

24 Q. Uh-huh.

25 A. -- in an application.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 And then -- but otherwise, I mean, I -- she now had  
2 publications, an online article. For me, that was sufficient.  
3 So I more or less decided that I was going to vote in her  
4 favor before I even went to the meeting, you know, based on  
5 the portfolio.

6 Q. I assume you've reviewed a lot of tenure portfolios by  
7 now at Southeastern. Is that true?

8 A. What now? I'm sorry.

9 Q. I'll just assume, since you've been at Southeastern for a  
10 while, that you've reviewed many tenure portfolios. Is that  
11 true?

12 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

13 THE COURT: Overruled.

14 Go ahead and answer.

15 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Have you reviewed many tenure portfolios  
16 as a professor at Southeastern?

17 A. Reviewed many of them? About four of them, I think,  
18 perhaps, maybe five. I can't --

19 Q. Okay. At the time you reviewed Dr. Tudor's 2009-2010  
20 portfolio, was there anything missing from it, like a section  
21 missing, documents missing?

22 A. No, not that I -- not that I recall. There were three  
23 binders, so it seemed, if anything, there was too much. I was  
24 under the impression that we had a set format we were supposed  
25 to submit and -- but I think one binder contained student

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 recommendations -- or, you know, student evaluations  
2 basically.

3 So that was a bit unusual as well. I didn't have a  
4 multivolume portfolio to look over before or since.

5 Q. Do you recall reviewing most of the documentation in that  
6 portfolio?

7 A. Well, there were a lot of, you know, evaluation letters.  
8 It was all of them. Would have been helpful. I looked them  
9 over.

10 And what I -- from my -- you know, talking to students  
11 and other ways, I -- my impression was that she was doing, you  
12 know, a good job in the classroom. So I really had no reason  
13 to -- you know, I certainly wasn't going to -- I mean, it was  
14 this thick of every evaluation that had been done since she'd  
15 been there.

16 Q. That's fair, sir.

17 Other than the candidate letter, which you didn't  
18 particularly like, you didn't see any other problems with the  
19 application?

20 A. No. The only -- it wasn't a strong application because  
21 there was just the one article. But, as I said, my own  
22 opinion is that an institution like ours, that the research  
23 element is, you know, exaggerated. We're primarily a teaching  
24 institution. That should be our focus. So as long as there  
25 was something.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1       Jesse Snowden had had a remark on what he thought was  
2 appropriate, and that's what I was going by. I don't know if  
3 it's appropriate for me to --

4           THE COURT: Just wait for a question.

5           THE WITNESS: Okay. I was just trying to explain my  
6 reasons behind my thought.

7           MR. YOUNG: I'll try to help you.

8 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Had you been told at some point by Jesse  
9 Snowden that there was a particular standard at Southeastern  
10 when it came to scholarship and research?

11 A. I had not been told personally, but I had heard it.

12 Q. Was that standard that you only needed one publication?

13 A. No. It was that zero is not enough. That's what he said  
14 basically, that there needed to be some scholarly engagement,  
15 you know --

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. -- essentially is what -- here again, I guess I'm  
18 reporting that secondhand, you know. So I -- he never told me  
19 that personally, but...

20 Q. Okay. Do you personally believe that Dr. Tudor deserved  
21 tenure in 2009-10?

22 A. Yes. I voted for her. It was not a strong application,  
23 but I voted for her. It was, you know -- I would even say it  
24 was weak, but it was adequate.

25 Q. Okay. But when you say it wasn't strong, that means it

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 just wasn't way over the bar; is that right?

2 A. Well, it was -- I mean, I've described it generally  
3 speaking. It was still weak, but it was adequate. It was  
4 enough for me to vote for her, you know.

5 Q. Have you had other applications -- you said you reviewed  
6 four to five -- other portfolios that were similarly -- that  
7 they met the standard?

8 A. Yes. It's always weakness in publications, is the  
9 weakness. And it would be slicing it pretty thin to call hers  
10 weaker than others that got tenure.

11 Q. Would you agree that that would be singling her out?

12 A. I'm not sure. I wouldn't -- it's slicing it pretty thin  
13 is the way I would describe it. I mean, ultimately, it's a  
14 bit of a judgment call, you know, but it's just -- the  
15 other -- the other people in the department got tenure on --  
16 they were not much stronger. It's almost always weakness.  
17 Not many publications is the weakness.

18 Q. Okay. I'm almost done with you, and then you're free.

19 I'd like to fast-forward to Dr. Tudor's 2010-11  
20 application.

21 Did you write a letter of recommendation for Dr. Tudor  
22 for that application?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay.

25 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Dr. Spencer, do you recognize the document  
3 I just handed to you?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Can you tell me what it is?

6 A. It's my recommendation letter I wrote in September 2010.

7 Q. Your recommendation for Dr. Tudor?

8 A. Right. In applying -- well, it was for applying for  
9 tenure, and I wrote a similar letter for other universities if  
10 she needed it to apply for. It was essentially the same  
11 letter.

12 Q. Okay.

13 MR. YOUNG: I'd like to move to enter Plaintiff's  
14 Exhibit 164 into evidence.

15 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Admitted.

17 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) So, Dr. Spencer, do you stand by what you  
18 wrote in this letter? Is this accurate, to your recollection?

19 A. I would -- I'm trying to help her out a little bit, you  
20 know, but as -- and, you know, I don't remember specifically  
21 seeing -- in other words, this portfolio was never distributed  
22 to us. I think when she asked me to write the letter, I  
23 probably must have -- she must have sent me a CV of some sort,  
24 but I don't recall that.

25 But I had heard from other faculty members and knew that

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 she had sent some articles out and was -- in fact, judging --  
2 when I see the letter again, I must have seen her CV and that  
3 she had five or six articles listed there. And then  
4 subsequently that year she won the award for scholarship, you  
5 know, I mean, from the faculty senate. So, I mean, there was  
6 a lot of -- there was a lot of scholarly activity.

7 As I said, in terms of teaching, I had -- I'd only had  
8 favorable impressions. So I was prepared to vote for her the  
9 first time. So this application was definitely stronger, so  
10 there was no reason why I would change my mind.

11 Q. At some point did you meet with Claire Stubblefield about  
12 Dr. Tudor?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you remember generally what that meeting was about?

15 A. Yes. She just wanted to go over my -- just like we  
16 pretty much did, in terms of what was my process, how did that  
17 go, basically.

18 Q. When you say "process," do you mean your tenure process?

19 A. Right. Well, the whole story of my intervention, you  
20 know, which supposedly was unusual. I mean, she was  
21 definitely of the opinion that you shouldn't be allowed to  
22 intervene like that.

23 Q. Who is of that opinion?

24 A. Claire.

25 Q. Do you have any idea what she was basing that opinion on?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. She said to let the process play out, was the words  
2 that --

3 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay and  
4 calls for speculation.

5 THE COURT: I'm not sure what we're talking about.  
6 Can you define what intervention we're talking about?

7 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Did you talk to Claire Stubblefield about  
9 your own tenure experience and the fact that you had talked  
10 with administrators before Interim President Snowden made a  
11 decision on your application

12 A. Right. Yes.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. It's kind of a complicated story, you know, as I've just  
15 detailed it. So she wanted to hear the story from me,  
16 essentially, what had happened. That's what she was --

17 Q. Okay. And a moment ago, before -- it's a confusing  
18 process. I think -- were you trying to say that Claire  
19 Stubblefield said that your opportunity to talk to the  
20 administration was unusual or something like that?

21 A. At least she --

22 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Leading and  
23 calls for hearsay.

24 THE COURT: Sustained.

25 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Did you talk to Claire Stubblefield about  
2 anything else other than your own tenure application process?

3 A. No, no. I just...

4 Q. Did Claire Stubblefield ask you any questions about the  
5 quality of Dr. Tudor's portfolio?

6 A. No. All she wanted to know was my story, basically.

7 Q. Do you recall whether she took notes during that meeting?

8 A. I don't recall her taking notes, actually. She may have,  
9 but I don't remember seeing her do that.

10 Q. Do you remember if she asked you follow-up questions?

11 A. I -- I mean, as best as I can recall, it was mostly me  
12 just rehearsing what I had done, essentially, and her  
13 thinking -- I mean, the reason I -- because if you -- if you  
14 can't intervene in the process, then it's all over when the  
15 final decision comes down. Then what can you do? Where is  
16 your appeal of any sort?

17 So that was my -- why I -- that's why I intervened, and  
18 I'm not really sure that I can agree with the notion that a  
19 person -- I think there should be some sort of appeal, you  
20 know, especially when you're not getting a written -- you  
21 know, you're not getting a detailed explanation of what the  
22 deficiencies are, you know.

23 To me, that's academic malpractice, basically, to be  
24 turning down someone and not giving them full explanation, and  
25 preferably in writing, as to why the application is deficient.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. One last -- or two questions for you. Then I'll  
2 turn you over to the State.

3 If you had a say in things, would you be okay with  
4 Dr. Tudor returning to the English department at Southeastern?

5 A. I don't have any particular problem. I mean, I'm  
6 retiring. I don't know if that's relevant in another year or  
7 so. But, I mean, no.

8 Q. Okay.

9 MR. YOUNG: We can just let it cut off there, and  
10 I'll turn you over to the State. Okay? And then I'll come  
11 back up, couple more questions, and then you get to go back to  
12 Durant.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Bunson.

14 MS. COFFEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

16 BY MR. BUNSON:

17 Q. Dr. Spencer, you indicated and testified earlier that  
18 your process was unusual.

19 Is that a fair characterization?

20 A. Claire said that it was. You know, I had no -- I had no  
21 reason -- to me, it was perfectly natural, that you should be  
22 able to go talk to whomever. So it was news to me, you know.  
23 That was the argument that she was presenting, that you should  
24 not intervene in the process.

25 Q. So it's not unusual for disagreement to occur at various

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 levels, is it?

2 A. No, not necessarily. I mean...

3 Q. And, in fact, in your case, there was lots of  
4 disagreement, wasn't there?

5 A. Oh, yeah, definitely.

6 Q. And, Dr. Spencer, Plaintiff's Exhibit 48, the letter from  
7 Jesse Snowden recommending you for tenure and promotion, do  
8 you have that in front of you?

9 A. Uh-huh.

10 Q. Is there any reason Dr. Snowden gives for recommending  
11 your tenure and promotion?

12 A. Is there any reasoning? I mean --

13 Q. Correct.

14 A. No, there's no explanation really.

15 Q. Do you recall giving Dr. Tudor any advice on her  
16 portfolio prior to its submission?

17 A. Only -- the advice I gave was immediately after my  
18 experience in 2006-2007, and I gave it to several other  
19 faculty members as well.

20 Q. And what was that advice?

21 A. I wouldn't go up for tenure without two articles.

22 Q. And you sat on her 2008-2009 application committee,  
23 didn't you?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. How many articles did she have in that one?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. There were none in the first one.

2 Q. So she ignored your advice?

3 A. Apparently. I was surprised.

4 Q. How many articles did she have in her 2009 portfolio?

5 A. There was one that was going to be -- I can't -- I think  
6 it was -- it was accepted, which more or less counts as  
7 published if you get a letter back from the, you know -- and  
8 the two articles was not necessarily my opinion. It was  
9 merely just, this was my experience had been -- because it's  
10 not just our department; you've got to get through the other  
11 levels as well that I -- you know, I -- if anybody -- if I had  
12 had any hint that I needed more than what I had had, I would  
13 have done it. But nobody -- I never got any -- I never had  
14 any hint from anybody that I needed more.

15 Q. Then you --

16 A. Here, it's clear that you do. So I told a couple of  
17 other -- I told Jani -- the other faculty members who were  
18 coming up for tenure, you know, to help out junior colleagues,  
19 spare yourself the trouble, you know, that what -- you know,  
20 that would be the safe level, and I wouldn't go up without  
21 that. Trying to help them out.

22 Q. And you earlier classified Dr. Tudor's 2009-2010  
23 portfolio as weak but adequate. Is that accurate?

24 A. Right. Because I voted for her. I mean, I've said it  
25 was weak, but I voted for it in the end and was prepared to

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 vote for it when I went into the meeting.

2 Q. Dr. Spencer, I want to make sure that we're clear. Some  
3 of these questions are just yes or no. I don't --

4 A. Okay. Okay.

5 Q. I don't want to take too much time, if it's okay.

6 Did Dr. Tudor follow the format you expected in her  
7 2009-2010 portfolio?

8 A. No, not really. I wasn't sure -- I'd only heard what the  
9 format was to be, but it struck me that it wasn't following,  
10 yeah.

11 Q. And weren't those expectations of the formatting set by  
12 the dean at the time?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Had you ever reviewed a multivolume portfolio other than  
15 Dr. Tudor's?

16 A. No, but Dr. Tudor may have been my first one. I was  
17 trying to think about that, you know, in the other questions.  
18 I believe that may have been the first one that I sat on.

19 Q. And, Dr. Spencer, the cover letter you talked about and  
20 you referred to as unprofessional, that's the first impression  
21 that a candidate's portfolio is presented to the committee;  
22 isn't that correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. Do you recall any indication or suggestion made by  
25 the chair, Lisa Coleman, or anyone else that stood out as a

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 reason that the committee may have voted to give a weak but  
2 adequate portfolio and a bizarre cover letter a vote for  
3 tenure and promotion in 2009-10?

4 A. Lisa Coleman did raise the transgender issue.

5 Q. And do you feel that that had any influence on the  
6 committee?

7 A. Here -- it's just my impression. If anything, I did feel  
8 that it was going against -- against her, and then -- like  
9 people -- this gets thrown out there and people talk about it  
10 and you can't get a really clear sense. No one says whether  
11 they think that this should make a difference or not. It sort  
12 of sits there.

13 Then, finally, it's -- then you call an end to the  
14 meeting and a vote is taken and it was the majority to  
15 approve. I can't remember the precise numbers on the vote.  
16 It's anonymous, but it may have been 4-1, if I -- I think it  
17 was 4-1, but I couldn't swear to that.

18 Q. Doctor, you just testified it was going bad. So what  
19 were you talking about?

20 A. That was just a general -- you know, I've seen this  
21 before in other ones where, you know, the discussion is out  
22 there and people are making negative comments and you're  
23 getting kind of a sense of which way it's going to go before  
24 the vote occurs. And that's a very subjective sense, but that  
25 was -- you know, I've seen that happen before, where it seems

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 that -- where at first people are being critical, and then you  
2 get a sense that, well, this is, you know -- but then it goes  
3 the other way.

4 It seems like it's almost always been a sense, first,  
5 that it's critical and kind of negative and then it sort of  
6 turns in favor. I don't think I've ever been on one where  
7 everybody comes out in the beginning and says that -- it's  
8 very positive and then for later criticisms to have it go the  
9 other way and deny.

10 Q. But Dr. Tudor's transgender status was something that the  
11 committee considered during their deliberations or at least  
12 was brought up by Lisa Coleman?

13 A. Lisa Coleman brought it up. But to what extent anyway --  
14 it was irrelevant to me, I mean, that was for sure. But to  
15 what extent anyone else considered it, I can't say, you know,  
16 for sure.

17 Q. Dr. Spencer, we've talked a bit and we've heard quite a  
18 bit of testimony about the Native American Symposium.

19 How were you involved with the Native American Symposium?

20 A. I'm the primary organizer of it.

21 Q. How many years have you been the primary organizer?

22 A. Since -- oh, there was another faculty member named Chad  
23 Litton. He was one of the original founders. So he was with  
24 us from 2003.

25 From 2005 until the present, I've been the primary

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 organizer of the academic portion of, you know, organizing the  
2 papers, putting the conference together.

3 As a co-chair there was Dan Althoff and then another  
4 person who ran the Native American Institute, Chris Wesberry  
5 became co-chair, but the heart of it is the academic  
6 conference, and I was always the primary organizer there.

7 Q. Is it a lot of work to put on the Native American  
8 Symposium?

9 A. It's a fair amount. Once I get all this in my computer,  
10 it's, you know -- you know, it's a matter of e-mail addresses.  
11 Once you've done it a few times, you know, the templates from  
12 one symposium are in my computer, and then I just type in the  
13 new version.

14 But, I mean, it lasts over a number of months. I have to  
15 maintain contact with the people who send proposals, you know.  
16 Then when I get them, I put together a schedule, things like  
17 that.

18 So, I mean, it's a significant -- it's been my primary  
19 service contribution to the school, basically, in my own  
20 tenure and promotion process.

21 Q. Have you ever worked with Dr. Tudor on the Native  
22 American Symposium?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And there's been testimony that Dr. Tudor was a co-editor  
25 of the Native American Symposium. Was that reflective of her

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 work, or was it mostly just in title?

2 A. She read the papers. That is pretty standard. I mean, I  
3 have no qualms about putting her as co-editor on it.

4 I mean, I did most of the actual sort of editing of the  
5 individual ones and formatted them on my computer, but she --  
6 you know, I gave her the papers, she read them, made some  
7 comments, and that's pretty typical in academic settings.

8 Q. You indicated that Dan Althoff was your co-chair.

9 So the years you worked with Dr. Tudor, was it you,  
10 Dr. Tudor, and Dan Althoff only who worked on the Native  
11 American Symposium?

12 A. There were one or two other -- Jane McMillan, Doug  
13 McMillan's sister, was on it. There were a couple of other  
14 people that would come and go, you know, over the years, a  
15 number of symposiums.

16 Q. Was the work evenly split amongst all of you?

17 A. Most of the -- the other members primarily helped on the  
18 event itself, which was crucial. I mean, they needed to be  
19 there and would show up for -- there would be several  
20 meetings, at least, leading up to the event and -- so they  
21 were very helpful, and I listed them as active members on the  
22 committee.

23 But in the sense that, you know -- I was -- in terms of  
24 organizing the academic conference, in particular -- sometimes  
25 we did some additional more local events, and Chris Wesberry

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 in particular was doing those. And Dan was contacting our  
2 primary speaker and, you know, arranging some of that.

3 But organizing the conference part itself, I was always  
4 the person essentially doing it.

5 Q. And, Doctor, I just want a number here. If you had to  
6 assess a percentage to the work you did yourself, what would  
7 that percentage be?

8 A. I would -- it would be over half. It would be, you know,  
9 maybe even as much as 60 percent perhaps, yeah.

10 Q. If you had to assess a percentage of the work Dan Althoff  
11 performed, what percentage would you give --

12 A. Maybe around 20.

13 Q. And just so that we aren't talking over each other, I'm  
14 going to need you to let me finish my question, because she's  
15 trying to get everything down. Is that okay?

16 A. Sure.

17 Q. Thank you.

18 So you were at 60, and you put Dan Althoff at 20 percent;  
19 is that correct?

20 A. Yeah, give or take 5 or 10, you know, percent, maybe.  
21 You know, 5 percent anyway. I would say I did over half.

22 Q. If you had to assess a percentage of the work Dr. Tudor  
23 and everyone else performed, what would that percentage be?

24 A. It would be in the 20 to 25 percent.

25 Q. So are you saying that Dr. Tudor herself was responsible

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 for that 20 to 25 percent?

2 A. No. There would be some other people, but she -- I would  
3 definitely put her -- she was the next most active, you know,  
4 after -- me, Dan, and Rachel, I would say.

5 MR. BUNSON: I have no further questions at this  
6 time.

7 THE COURT: Redirect?

8 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

9 BY MR. YOUNG:

10 Q. Dr. Spencer, before you came into the courtroom, we were  
11 having a conversation about odd things in tenure portfolios.

12 Do you remember that?

13 A. Of -- which about the tenure portfolios?

14 Q. That sometimes professors applying for tenure put odd  
15 things in their portfolios.

16 A. Oh, right, right. Okay.

17 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Mr. Young is  
18 testifying for him.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Okay. Have you had occasion to review  
21 portfolios other than Dr. Tudor's, where there were things in  
22 the portfolio that didn't make sense to you?

23 A. No, not really, because everyone else pretty closely  
24 adhered to Lucretia Scoufos's model. I mean, she was very  
25 particular about how it had to be. And I don't think I saw a

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 single portfolio after that that didn't conform, you know,  
2 slavishly, you know, in terms of which type of plastic folder  
3 and which way it opened as opposed to -- even.

4 I know I certainly did when I went up for full professor.

5 Q. So if Dean Scoufos hadn't clearly communicated her  
6 preferences to someone, would it be hard for a portfolio to  
7 look the way she wanted it to look?

8 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
9 speculation.

10 THE COURT: Overruled.

11 THE WITNESS: I didn't find -- I mean, it was a bit  
12 of a pain, and, you know, I thought it was silly of her to  
13 some extent, I mean, even to which way the plastic folder  
14 should open.

15 But, in the end, it made -- it made kind of a nice  
16 product in the end.

17 BY MR. YOUNG:

18 Q. I understand that. I asked you a different question.

19 It sounds like Dean Scoufos had very particular  
20 preferences; is that right?

21 A. Right.

22 Q. If Dean Scoufos hadn't been really careful and explained  
23 that to someone, would it be hard for them to comply with  
24 those preferences?

25 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 speculation.

2 THE WITNESS: It wasn't for me when I did it.

3 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

4 THE COURT: Move on.

5 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) I think you said during cross-examination  
6 that Dr. Tudor was the co-editor of the Native American  
7 Symposium; is that right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. How would someone who wasn't deeply involved in the  
10 symposium figure out who's a co-editor of the proceedings?

11 A. Well, I -- I invited her to be, you know, basically.

12 Q. Different question.

13 How would someone on the outside figure out if someone is  
14 the co-editor of the Native American Symposium proceedings?  
15 Is there a book? Is there an announcement?

16 A. Oh, someone on the outside trying to determine?

17 Q. Yeah.

18 A. Well, that would be a difficult publication, you know,  
19 unless it's spelled out in the introduction sometimes. Yeah,  
20 they'd have to ask me.

21 Q. If you were asked, would you have been able to identify  
22 who your co-editors were?

23 A. Sure.

24 Q. Did the cover of the Native American Symposium  
25 proceedings have the co-editors on it?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes. Lucretia Scoufos was a co-editor of one -- you  
2 know, a symposium or two before. I think I even had Chad  
3 Litton's name on there, but that was more -- I think he had  
4 just received papers and stuff, but....

5 Q. I think you testified during cross that during your own  
6 tenure application, that the vast majority of your service was  
7 the Native American Symposium; is that right?

8 A. For the most -- there was some other department service.  
9 I had been on committees.

10 I've never been -- I'm not as interested in university  
11 politics, so I've actually more or less tried to stay out of  
12 the university-wide-level things.

13 So the symposium was my kind of larger university. But I  
14 was very active in the department, so I don't think that my  
15 service was deficient in any way. But I definitely did not go  
16 out of the way like other faculty members have and been -- you  
17 know, I could have been more active at the university level,  
18 but I didn't want to be.

19 Q. Would it be unusual for a professor seeking tenure in the  
20 English department to do service in a lot of different areas  
21 instead of mainly in one?

22 A. Sure. I mean, it's -- the joke is that nobody is denied  
23 tenure because of service, you know. So, I mean -- so if  
24 people want to be slackers, you can be a slacker in that  
25 regard.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 But other people -- you know, some people have it more --  
2 you know, their own personal sense of either obligation or  
3 wanting to make a contribution and so forth.

4 So, yes, some people are -- I mean, in fact, you usually  
5 wind up with kind of a core group that does most of the  
6 university-wide things in the faculty senate and elsewhere.

7 Q. Do you have any awareness as to whether Dr. Tudor's  
8 service was cited as a reason to deny her tenure?

9 A. I never heard anything to that effect or saw it. It  
10 wasn't -- I didn't see anything why it should be.

11 MR. YOUNG: That's it. Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Any redirect?

13 MR. BUNSON: No, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you.

15 (Witness excused.)

16 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

17 MS. NOVOTNY: Plaintiff calls Dr. Randy Prus.

18 THE WITNESS: Leave these here?

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 Please come right up here, face the clerk, and be sworn.

21 (Witness duly sworn.)

22 THE COURT: Be seated.

23 WHEREUPON, RANDY PRUS, Ph.D., after having been first  
24 duly sworn, testifies in reply to the questions propounded as  
25 follows:

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

**DIRECT EXAMINATION**

BY MS. NOVOTNY:

Q. Hello there, Dr. Prus. Thank you for coming here and taking time out of your schedule, as the jurors have had to do and many other witnesses.

I'm going to try to keep this short for us.

When did you start working at Southeastern Oklahoma State?

A. August 1991.

Q. And what was your title when you began?

A. Assistant professor.

Q. And what's your title at Southeastern currently?

A. Professor and chair.

Q. And what are you chair of?

A. The department of English, Humanities, and Languages.

Q. Great.

Now, when did you become chair of the department of English, Humanities, and Languages?

A. August 2010.

Q. And as chair of the department and previously just being a member of the department along with Dr. Tudor, would you say you were pretty familiar with Dr. Tudor's work?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you were on, in fact, a committee that had something to do with Dr. Tudor's tenure and promotion; is that

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 correct?

2 A. Correct. I was on the tenure promotion committee in  
3 2009.

4 Q. And can you help explain for us here today what your role  
5 on that committee in 2009 was?

6 A. My role was to review the portfolio, attend the meeting,  
7 discuss the merits of the portfolio and her work in the  
8 department. And a vote was taken, and the results were passed  
9 on to the department chair.

10 Q. Okay. And do you recall what that vote was?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. And what was that vote?

13 A. The vote was 4 to 1 in favor of tenure and promotion.

14 Q. So the committee then at that point recommended tenure  
15 for Dr. Tudor?

16 A. The committee did, yes.

17 Q. And who was the one dissenter?

18 A. Me.

19 Q. Okay. And what was your reasoning for voting against  
20 tenure at that time?

21 A. Well, I -- the cover letter lacked professional  
22 competence. Dr. Tudor made an argument that three people on  
23 campus who weren't qualified for tenure deserved tenure, and,  
24 therefore, she did.

25 And as writing instructors, we teach for audience and

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 purpose. And she was addressing this to a group of people  
2 with doctorates and tenure -- and tenure. It didn't make  
3 sense.

4 Q. I see. And so you didn't -- you disagreed with the cover  
5 letter.

6 Did you know of any publications that Dr. Tudor had at  
7 that time?

8 A. She had one.

9 Q. Okay. And were there other professors who had earned  
10 tenure that had only one publication at that time?

11 A. I can't speak -- I don't remember.

12 Q. Okay. Now, ultimately, though, the committee votes and  
13 takes a position as a committee; is that correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And do you stand behind the committee's decision to --

16 A. Well, as part of the committee, yes.

17 Q. Okay. So you stand behind the committee's decision to  
18 recommend tenure and promotion?

19 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

20 THE COURT: Sustained.

21 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Were you familiar with Dr. Tudor's work  
22 other than publications and the cover letter you spoke of?

23 A. In 2009?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. Yes. I visited her classroom once or twice. Twice, I

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 think.

2 Q. What was your impression of Dr. Tudor as a teacher?

3 A. Still had work to do. She could have been more engaging,  
4 energetic, but she was plugging away.

5 Q. Are all tenured professors energetic and engaging?

6 A. "Aren't all"? I don't understand your question.

7 Q. I said, "Are all tenured professors engaging and  
8 energetic?" Let me strike that and rephrase.

9 So you said that Dr. Tudor was not necessarily energetic  
10 and engaging. Are there tenured professors who are tenured  
11 but are not engaging and energetic people?

12 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. That's just a  
13 confusing question.

14 THE COURT: I understand it.

15 Can you answer that?

16 THE WITNESS: Are there tenured professors who  
17 aren't engaging?

18 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Yeah.

19 A. Sure.

20 Q. Okay. That's all I was asking.

21 All righty. You know what? That is -- well, no. I had  
22 a couple other questions.

23 Did administrators ever come to you and tell you which  
24 bathroom you should use specifically?

25 A. No.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Did you know of any other English professors who were  
2 told and given direction to use a specific restroom while they  
3 were at work?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Did you know that Dr. Tudor was instructed to only use  
6 one restroom specifically?

7 A. At the time, no, but I've heard allegations since then.

8 Q. Okay. But you've never heard of any other professor  
9 being told what specific restroom to use?

10 A. That's correct.

11 MR. YOUNG: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Joseph?

13 MR. JOSEPH: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 Given the limited direct examination and the university's  
15 intention to call this witness in its case in chief, we  
16 request permission to examine outside the scope of plaintiff's  
17 direct questioning at this time.

18 MS. NOVOTNY: I'm going to object to that on  
19 relevance and duplicativeness.

20 We've heard lots of testimony from many witnesses  
21 about --

22 THE COURT: I don't think you can actually lodge  
23 that objection until you've heard any question asked.  
24 Certainly, I will consider those on a case-by-case basis.

25 But for the convenience of both the witness and the jury,

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 I think it's entirely logical, if you intend to recall this  
2 witness, that you simply do your inquiry now so that it will  
3 not be necessary to recall.

4 MR. JOSEPH: That's precisely what I'd like to do,  
5 Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: I know.

7 Having said that, obviously, this is not going to be as  
8 short as direct, so I think we'll go ahead and break for  
9 lunch.

10 Let me instruct you not to discuss the case or permit  
11 others to discuss it with you.

12 Until about 15 minutes ago, you were going to get a long  
13 lunch hour because we had a criminal matter scheduled at one  
14 o'clock, but that's now been continued.

15 So I'll ask you to be in the jury assembly room at 10  
16 after 1:00.

17 Counsel, the meeting we had planned during lunch hour, I  
18 will postpone until the end of the trial day.

19 We'll be in recess.

20 (In recess from 12:15 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.)

21 (Jury enters.)

22 THE COURT: Be seated.

23 Please continue.

24 MR. JOSEPH: Thank you, Your Honor.

25

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

**CROSS-EXAMINATION**

BY MR. JOSEPH:

Q. Dr. Prus, I'm not sure if this happened on the original examination, but will you please state your name for the record, please.

A. Randy Thomas Prus.

Q. Dr. Prus, I believe you testified earlier that you are currently the chair of the EHL department at Southeastern; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. What are your duties there as chair?

A. My duties are to make schedules for full-time and adjuncts, approximately 24 faculty; evaluate faculty, and handle any kind of questions that come up. I represent the department on academic council and other committees as well.

Q. And do you have any duties in the tenure and promotion review and application process?

A. Yes. After it goes to the department committee, it comes to the department chair, who provides an evaluation and passes it on to now the vice president.

Q. And do you teach any student classes in addition to these other duties you mentioned?

A. I teach two classes.

Q. Okay. And do you know the plaintiff, Dr. Rachel Tudor?

A. Yes, I do.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. And just very briefly, how do you know Dr. Tudor?

2 A. She was -- she worked in the department from 2004 to  
3 2011.

4 Q. Okay. Are you -- were you the chair at the department of  
5 EHL when Dr. Tudor first applied for tenure?

6 A. No, I wasn't.

7 Q. And were you the chair of the EHL department the second  
8 time she applied for tenure in 2009-2010?

9 A. No, I wasn't.

10 Q. Okay. If you would, in brief, walk the jury through the  
11 duties of a member of a tenure and promotion committee -- a  
12 member of that committee -- in the EHL department during that  
13 2009-2010 time frame.

14 A. We were -- we'd review the portfolio and the candidate's  
15 work in the department and the university. We discussed the  
16 merits, generally based on teaching, scholarship, and service.  
17 Then we'd vote on whether to approve or -- to recommend or not  
18 recommend tenure and promotion.

19 And the chair of that committee then writes up the report  
20 and passes that on to the department chair and notifies the  
21 candidate of the result.

22 Q. Okay. And in 2009-2010, when Dr. Tudor applied for  
23 tenure, I believe you testified earlier that you individually  
24 were not in favor of granting tenure. Is that accurate?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. And I believe you mentioned an application letter,  
2 and you said it was poor. Was that your word?

3 A. It wasn't professionally competent. I think that's the  
4 term I used.

5 Q. Okay. Was -- can you expand briefly on what you mean by  
6 that?

7 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. He's already testified to  
8 this.

9 THE COURT: Sustained.

10 MR. JOSEPH: Okay.

11 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) In terms of the letter, did it appear to  
12 you that the letter understood its intended audience?

13 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. He's already testified to  
14 that. Duplicative.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 MR. JOSEPH: Okay.

17 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) In terms of her portfolio, was there a  
18 collection of poetry included with that document?

19 A. It was a collection of poems in a journal with "open mic"  
20 put on top of it.

21 Q. And by "open mic," do you know what that term means?

22 A. I know it's in reference to sometimes open poetry  
23 readings where people can just gather to read.

24 I wasn't sure -- it seemed as if she were passing off  
25 journal -- a personal journal as a form of publication.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. And, in your opinion in 2009-2010, was that an  
2 appropriate publication for a tenure and portfolio  
3 application?

4 A. No, it wasn't.

5 Q. Okay. Is Corey Delashaw a tenured member of the faculty?

6 A. No, she isn't.

7 Q. Okay. Is Kim McGeehee?

8 A. No, he wasn't -- he's retired since, but he wasn't at the  
9 time.

10 Q. Okay. And was Theresa Anderson at that time a tenured  
11 member of the faculty?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Okay. So to the extent that Dr. Tudor's portfolio  
14 referenced them, do you have an opinion about whether or not  
15 that was appropriate?

16 A. It wasn't appropriate.

17 Q. What is a chapbook?

18 A. A chapbook is a small collection of poetry, 20, 30, 40  
19 pages maybe.

20 Q. And is the chapbook the same thing as the open mic book  
21 that you referenced a moment ago?

22 A. No. Chapbooks have their own publishers.

23 Q. Okay. Did Dr. Tudor include any chapbooks in her  
24 portfolio?

25 A. Not that I -- except for the open mic. That's the only

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 one I recall.

2 Q. Okay. And was there anything that you found problematic  
3 with Dr. Tudor's actual publication or publications in the  
4 2009-10 application committee meeting?

5 A. It seemed to be -- there weren't very many recent  
6 references, and the field is somewhat dynamic. And it didn't  
7 show -- didn't quite show promise; right?

8 As I think I might have mentioned -- maybe I didn't --  
9 tenure for me is not just a reward but a promise of what  
10 further work one is going to do in a field, and I didn't see  
11 that promise.

12 Q. And by that you mean a promise from the candidate  
13 demonstrating potential?

14 A. Yeah.

15 Q. Okay. Did you consider Dr. Tudor's work on Southeastern  
16 University's Native American Symposium to be a work of  
17 scholarship or was it a work of service?

18 A. A work of service, I would categorize it.

19 Q. Did you consider it to be noteworthy for appropriate  
20 purposes of tenure and promotion?

21 A. It certainly wasn't outstanding, but it was -- it added  
22 to it.

23 Q. Okay. How many -- I believe you may have testified to  
24 this; I just couldn't hear you earlier.

25 How many total professors were on Dr. Tudor's 2009-10

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 application committee?

2 A. Five.

3 Q. Okay. And was there discussion between the members of  
4 the committee in meeting about whether or not to recommend  
5 Dr. Tudor for tenure that year?

6 A. Yes, there was discussion.

7 Q. Okay. Is there anything about that discussion you can  
8 share with us?

9 A. That I can share with you?

10 It was pretty extensive and it -- the meeting was  
11 probably at least an hour or so. It was discussed longer than  
12 most committees.

13 Q. Okay. Earlier today we heard testimony from Dr. Mark  
14 Spencer.

15 Was Dr. Mark Spencer on the same committee that you were  
16 thinking of in 2009-2010?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And Dr. Spencer testified that the issue of  
19 Dr. Tudor's transgender status came up in that committee  
20 discussion.

21 Do you remember that?

22 A. Not directly.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. But I think it was in the room.

25 Q. Okay. And was it in the room in a positive light?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Do you remember anyone specifically mentioning it in a  
3 positive light?

4 A. I don't remember anyone mentioning it, but there were --  
5 I know one colleague, and maybe two --

6 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. Hearsay.

7 THE COURT: Don't know.

8 I think you've answered the question. Stop and wait for  
9 another.

10 THE WITNESS: Okay.

11 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) Dr. Prus, did you have an additional  
12 thought that you wanted to share with us?

13 A. Well, I was going to say that, in my sense, the  
14 transgender issue was there because I know at least one  
15 colleague who didn't read the portfolio and perhaps another  
16 one as well based on their discussion of the portfolio.

17 Q. And so when you say they didn't read the portfolio, what  
18 does that mean?

19 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. Calls for speculation.

20 THE COURT: Overruled.

21 Go ahead. You can answer.

22 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

23 Repeat that.

24 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) Sure. I think I -- I apologize.

25 I think you said it was in the room, and I think you said

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 one or two people didn't read the portfolio. And I asked you  
2 what you meant by that, "didn't read the portfolio."

3 A. Well, when discussing the letter, for example, they  
4 didn't know what we were referring to.

5 Q. Was there any sense on your part that other members of  
6 the committee didn't understand the significance or the lack  
7 thereof of the inclusion of the open mic material?

8 A. Yeah. I don't think they understood the nature of poetry  
9 and poetry publications, yeah.

10 Q. Okay. And, Dr. Prus, is poetry one of the subjects that  
11 you teach?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Do you consider yourself fairly well versed in  
14 poetry?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. So I believe you were telling us that one or two  
17 members of the committee, you think, maybe didn't read the  
18 portfolio, and that, as a result of that, what leads you to --  
19 what leads you to connect that with the fact that there was  
20 some consideration of Dr. Tudor's transgender status?

21 MS. NOVOTNY: Objection. Calls for speculation.

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 THE WITNESS: Because the support for Dr. Tudor  
24 without considering the portfolio leads me to that conclusion.

25 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) Now, you still voted -- you individually,

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 I mean, still voted within the committee not to recommend  
2 Dr. Tudor for tenure that year, didn't you?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Were you worried about being accused of being transphobic  
5 or a bigot?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Okay. Ultimately, that committee did vote to recommend  
8 Dr. Tudor's tenure, did it not?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. After Tudor's tenure and promotion packet left your  
11 committee, where did it go next?

12 A. To the department chair.

13 Q. And did you personally deliver it to the department  
14 chair?

15 A. No. It would have been the chair of the committee. I'm  
16 thinking it might have been Dr. Coleman. I'm not exactly sure  
17 who chaired it, but I didn't.

18 Q. Is that Dr. Lisa Coleman?

19 A. Yes, yes.

20 Q. Okay. Was Dr. Lisa Coleman one of the one or two people  
21 in the room that you felt like may not have read the  
22 portfolio?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. Did Dr. Scoufos -- who was Dr. Scoufos at that  
25 time?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. At that time, she was the dean of Arts & Sciences.

2 Q. And did Dr. Scoufos recommend Dr. Tudor's tenure and  
3 promotion portfolio be recommended for tenure?

4 A. She did not recommend.

5 Q. Okay. After Dean Scoufos reviewed the tenure and  
6 promotion application, do you know where it went next?

7 A. To Vice President McMillan.

8 Q. Okay. And did Dr. McMillan recommend tenure for  
9 Dr. Tudor's application that year?

10 A. No.

11 Q. After Vice President McMillan had reviewed and made his  
12 recommendation, where did Dr. Tudor's portfolio go then?

13 A. To the president, President Minks.

14 Q. And, to your knowledge, did then President Minks  
15 recommend Dr. Tudor for tenure?

16 A. He did not recommend.

17 Q. Okay. To your knowledge, did Dr. Tudor have the  
18 opportunity to withdraw her tenure and promotion portfolio in  
19 the '09-'10 year before it was denied?

20 A. I don't have firsthand information on that, but that's  
21 what I understand the situation to be.

22 Q. Okay.

23 THE COURT: Unlike the usual situation, both of you  
24 are too close to the mics. You're popping. If you'll just  
25 back up a little bit.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. JOSEPH: I'm sorry if I'm blowing anyone's  
2 eardrums out, Your Honor. I apologize.

3 Q. (BY MR. JOSEPH) Dr. Prus, did anyone in particular take  
4 over any duties that were slotted for Dr. Tenure [sic] had she  
5 been given tenure and promotion?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Okay. As the current chair of the English, Humanities,  
8 and Languages department at Southeastern, do you think it  
9 would be a good thing for that department if Dr. Tudor came  
10 back to work there now?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Do you think it would be a good thing for those students  
13 if Dr. Tudor came back to work now?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Do you think it would be a good thing for the university  
16 if Dr. Tudor came back to work there now?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Okay.

19 MR. JOSEPH: Nothing further, Your Honor.

20 Thank you, Dr. Prus, ladies and gentlemen.

21 THE COURT: Ms. Novotny.

22 MS. NOVOTNY: Judge, if I may approach briefly just  
23 to confer?

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 (The following proceedings were had at the bench and out

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 of the hearing of the jury.)

2 MS. NOVOTNY: I just want to make sure to clarify  
3 that, because of the strange situation under Rule 611, so I'm  
4 allowed to cross on anything that he brought up?

5 THE COURT: Yes.

6 MS. NOVOTNY: Okay.

7 THE COURT: Sure.

8 MS. NOVOTNY: I just wanted to make sure we were  
9 clear. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Uh-huh.

11 (The following proceedings were had in open court with  
12 all parties present and within the hearing of the jury.)

13 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

14 BY MS. NOVOTNY:

15 Q. All right. Dr. Prus, thanks for sticking with us still  
16 here.

17 On examination just a moment ago, you indicated that  
18 there was a collection of poems in the journal that was part  
19 of Dr. Tudor's portfolio.

20 Is poetry something that's part of the English,  
21 Humanities, and Languages department?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Yeah.

24 And do you consider yourself more of a poetry expert or  
25 more of a tenure expert?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Poetry expert.

2 Q. Thank you.

3 And while you may have had issues with Dr. Tudor's  
4 2009-2010 portfolio, isn't it true that you actually helped  
5 Dr. Tudor improve her portfolio for the 2010-2011 cycle so  
6 that she could have a better chance at meeting some of the  
7 deficiencies that you felt were there?

8 A. That is true.

9 Q. And did she take direction from you and make improvements  
10 that you felt were improving her chances of getting tenure  
11 that next time around?

12 A. If she made the changes I recommended. I didn't see the  
13 final portfolio because it never got to the chair.

14 Q. Sure.

15 Were you aware that she was getting additional works  
16 published between the 2009-10 application and the 2010-2011  
17 publication?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Would that additional work -- publication of  
20 peer-reviewed works, would that have been something that would  
21 have strengthened her chances of tenure, in your eyes?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Now, you indicated that you thought your colleagues maybe  
24 didn't fully read her 2009-2010 portfolio?

25 A. That's correct.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Isn't it true that many folks who review tenure  
2 applications will, you know, skim certain parts of it and  
3 focus on the parts that they think are most important?

4 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
5 speculation.

6 THE COURT: Overruled.

7 THE WITNESS: I would hope not, but I'm sure they  
8 do.

9 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Now, you indicated before that you were  
10 not necessarily sure you would welcome Dr. Tudor back.

11 Do you think other faculty in the English department  
12 would welcome Dr. Tudor back at Southeastern?

13 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
14 speculation.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer if you know.

17 THE WITNESS: I -- we didn't discuss it formally as  
18 a department, but informally, I spoke with my colleagues, and  
19 it might be split at best, you know. There are a few -- there  
20 are those who would object to it for a variety of reasons.

21 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Now, you are currently the chair of a  
22 department at Southeastern.

23 Is your boss at Southeastern in the room right now?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. So many professors move up the ranks and eventually move

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 into administration.

2 I think we've heard testimony that Dr. Scoufos was a  
3 professor before she was dean.

4 Do you have plans on a next move of getting into the  
5 administration?

6 A. No.

7 Q. I want to come back to that 2010-2011 tenure application.

8 Did something happen at some point that stopped Dr. Tudor  
9 from being able to proceed with that application?

10 A. Dr. Tudor and I were called into the dean's office, and  
11 we had to sign for letters. And I believe it was -- I can't  
12 remember the exact wording, but she was stopped from -- told  
13 that she couldn't come up for tenure.

14 Q. Was this unusual to you?

15 A. It was unusual being called into the dean's office to be  
16 handed a letter, yes.

17 Q. Were you given any notice before that meeting about what  
18 the meeting would be about?

19 A. No.

20 Q. And hadn't you, in fact, been putting together  
21 Dr. Tudor's committee to review her new tenure application?

22 A. As per the policy and procedures manual, yes.

23 Q. And so the policy and procedures, as you understood them,  
24 allowed Dr. Tudor to correct any deficiencies that  
25 Dean Scoufos found in the prior year and that she should have

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 the right to have that independently reviewed in 2010-2011;  
2 correct?

3 A. I'm not sure because I'm not sure -- when this situation  
4 happened in 2010 -- it was September, I think, and I started  
5 the job August 1st. So much of this was ongoing with the  
6 prior chair.

7 Q. Were you aware that Dean Scoufos had been the person who  
8 issued the denial of Dr. Tudor's tenure application in  
9 2009-2010, when you were helping Dr. Tudor with her 2010-2011  
10 application?

11 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. Misstates  
12 evidence.

13 THE COURT: I don't understand the question.  
14 There's too much in there. Break it down.

15 MS. NOVOTNY: Understood.

16 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) So in 2009-2010, you were on that  
17 committee that voted to give Dr. Tudor tenure, and then  
18 Dean Scoufos ended up issuing a recommendation not for tenure  
19 after that came to her office; is that correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And was Dean Scoufos still the person who was going to be  
22 getting the application after it moved through the committee  
23 again?

24 A. In 2009?

25 Q. In 2010-2011. I'm sorry.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yeah. She would have been part of the process.

2 Q. When you applied for tenure, was your application and  
3 portfolio perfect?

4 MR. JOSEPH: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.

5 THE COURT: Sustained.

6 Q. (BY MS. NOVOTNY) Do you think that Dr. Tudor's 2010-2011  
7 application would have merited tenure?

8 A. Certainly the department and the chair. How the dean and  
9 vice president would have perceived it, I'm not sure.

10 Q. And you were, in fact, chair in 2010-2011?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And so you would have thought that that application did  
13 merit tenure?

14 A. Yes.

15 MS. NOVOTNY: Nothing further.

16 THE COURT: Anything else?

17 MR. JOSEPH: Very briefly, Your Honor.

18 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION**

19 BY MR. JOSEPH:

20 Q. Dr. Prus, you mentioned, in examination by opposing  
21 counsel, the policies and procedures.

22 Are you referring to the Academic Policies and Procedures  
23 Manual?

24 A. Correct, correct.

25 Q. Okay. And under the APPM, doesn't it say that applicants

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 may apply in their fifth, sixth, or seventh year?

2 A. I believe so. The policy has been revised recently.

3 Q. Well, thank you for that clarification. Let me rephrase  
4 my question, then.

5 Was it your understanding in 2009-2010 school year that  
6 the academic policy and procedure manual said an applicant may  
7 apply in their fifth, sixth, or seventh year?

8 A. That sounds -- that sounds right.

9 Q. And that's different than fifth, sixth, and seventh year,  
10 isn't it?

11 A. Sure.

12 Q. Okay.

13 MR. JOSEPH: Nothing further. Thank you, Your  
14 Honor.

15 THE COURT: You may step down.

16 (Witness excused.)

17 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

18 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, we're calling Dr. James  
19 Knapp. My co-counsel will get him. For the benefit of  
20 everyone in this room -- thank you, Dr. Prus; it's good seeing  
21 you -- Dr. James Knapp will be the last doctor of the day.

22 THE COURT: Good.

23 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

24 THE COURT: While we're waiting on him, let me see  
25 counsel at the bench.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

2 (The following proceedings were had at the bench and out  
3 of the hearing of the jury.)

4 THE COURT: So who else do you have?

5 MR. YOUNG: Mindy House. She's on the list. I  
6 think she's in the middle.

7 THE COURT: And that's all?

8 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

9 THE COURT: Are you going to call Cathy Conway?  
10 Sherri, let's be off the record. This is just  
11 scheduling.

12 (Bench conference held off the record with all counsel.)

13 (The following proceedings were had in open court with  
14 all parties present and within the hearing of the jury.)

15 THE COURT: Please come right up here. Step right  
16 up here beside the witness stand and face the clerk and be  
17 sworn.

18 (Witness duly sworn.)

19 THE COURT: Be seated.

20 WHEREUPON, JAMES KNAPP, Ph.D., after having been first  
21 duly sworn, testifies in reply to the questions propounded as  
22 follows:

23 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

24 BY MR. YOUNG:

25 Q. Hi. Good afternoon, Dr. Knapp. Thanks for making the

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 drive up here.

2 You can put that microphone -- it will move, and you can  
3 bring it up to where it's comfortable. If I can't hear you,  
4 I'll just tell you. And just like the deposition, ask,  
5 answer.

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Dr. Knapp, what's your occupation?

8 A. Professor.

9 Q. Where do you work?

10 A. Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

11 Q. When did you first start working at Southeastern?

12 A. In the fall of 1995.

13 Q. Are you a tenured professor?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. So you yourself have gone through the tenure process at  
16 Southeastern?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. And what's your current job title?

19 A. Professor of sociology.

20 Q. Okay. Dr. Knapp, are you familiar with, I guess, the  
21 booklet titled the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual at  
22 Southeastern?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. What is it?

25 A. It is a manual that guides the activities of the

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 university.

2 Q. Okay. Does that manual have a section with policies on  
3 the tenure process?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. To your knowledge, are the policies in the -- can I call  
6 it the APPM?

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. Okay. So, to your knowledge, are the policies in the  
9 APPM the only policies at Southeastern that govern the tenure  
10 process?

11 A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

12 Q. Are those the same policies you yourself replied upon  
13 when you went up for tenure?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. Dr. Knapp, have you ever served on a faculty  
16 appellate committee at Southeastern?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Do you happen to recall how many?

19 A. I believe it was three.

20 Q. You're smiling at me. Okay.

21 Did all of those committees involve Dr. Rachel Tudor?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Are those the only committees you've ever served on? Let  
24 me withdraw that question.

25 Are those three committees the only faculty appellate

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 committees that you have served on at Southeastern?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. Let's talk about the first faculty appellate  
4 committee that you served on. Okay.

5 Do you know when about that grievance was filed?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Okay. I believe during your deposition you testified  
8 that that grievance was filed in early 2010, but I'm going to  
9 give you an exhibit to help you out. Okay?

10 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, may I approach?

11 THE COURT: Yes.

12 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

13 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Do you recognize Plaintiff's Exhibit 32?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. What is it?

16 A. It is an e-mail written by me to Dr. Weiner.

17 Q. Okay.

18 MR. YOUNG: I would like to move to introduce into  
19 evidence Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

20 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Admitted.

22 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

23 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) So does Plaintiff's Exhibit 32 refresh  
24 your memory as to when exactly you were part of the first  
25 appellate committee involving a grievance with Dr. Rachel

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Tudor?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. You said that you -- I'm sorry. For me to follow,  
4 you said you wrote this e-mail?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you some questions about this  
7 grievance.

8 Do you recall what this first grievance was about?

9 A. Generally, yes.

10 Q. Okay. So why don't you explain to the jury what this  
11 first grievance was about.

12 A. Dr. Tudor had applied for tenure and promotion, and it  
13 had been denied. And it came to the faculty appellate  
14 committee.

15 Q. Okay. Was Dr. Tudor seeking specific relief from the  
16 faculty appellate committee?

17 A. That, I don't recall.

18 Q. Okay. Was Dr. Tudor just grieving that she had been  
19 denied tenure or was she asking for an explanation?

20 A. No. Can you give me a minute to read it?

21 Q. Yes, of course.

22 A. Would you ask your question again?

23 Q. Yes.

24 Do you recall what Dr. Tudor was asking the faculty  
25 appellate committee for when she filed in grievance?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. The dean and vice president for academic affairs had  
2 denied her application and were not providing a detailed  
3 explanation for why they had denied it.

4 Q. Okay. So, I believe, in this exhibit, Plaintiff's  
5 Exhibit 34, which you wrote, you state that you thought that a  
6 policy in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual,  
7 Policy 3.7.4, required that the administrators provide an  
8 explanation to Dr. Tudor for why they denied her tenure  
9 application. Is that right?

10 A. Not required.

11 Q. Can you explain?

12 A. Recommended.

13 Q. Recommended. Okay.

14 A. It says "should."

15 Q. So can you explain how you are distinguishing between  
16 "required" and "should"?

17 A. Well -- and I had placed the emphasis on this in the  
18 document.

19 Q. Uh-huh.

20 A. "Concur with the faculty judgment except in rare  
21 instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in  
22 detail."

23 So I don't believe it was saying that it is a requirement  
24 that they be stated in detail. So that's why I would use the  
25 word "recommended."

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. Let me give you another exhibit.

2 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, may I approach the witness  
3 one more time?

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

6 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Dr. Knapp, do you recognize this exhibit?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. What is it?

9 A. It is an e-mail.

10 Q. Did you send this e-mail?

11 A. Yes, I did.

12 Q. Okay.

13 MR. YOUNG: I would like to move to enter  
14 Plaintiff's Exhibit 34.

15 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Admitted.

17 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Okay. Dr. Knapp, so do you see that  
18 e-mail at the bottom? You can use that screen next to you or  
19 the paper in front of you. It's the same document.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Do you see the e-mail at the bottom of the second page of  
22 that exhibit that I just handed you?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. And on that e-mail, it looks like -- I'm sorry.  
25 It looks like there's a photocopy error. It sounds like one

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 of the fellow members of your committee is saying that they  
2 think that Dr. Scoufos and Dr. McMillan should provide a  
3 rationale to Dr. Tudor; is that right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Does that mean that Dr. Scoufos and McMillan had the  
6 option to provide the rationale?

7 A. I'm not sure about that.

8 Q. Can you explain that?

9 A. The committee is recommending --

10 Q. Uh-huh.

11 A. -- that they provide their rationale.

12 As an individual, I would hope they would provide their  
13 rationale, but I don't -- again, I don't know if they are  
14 required to do so.

15 Q. Would it be unusual for administrators, high-up  
16 administrators at Southeastern, like the dean and the vice  
17 president for academic affairs, to not follow the collegial  
18 recommendation of the faculty appellate committee?

19 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor.

20 Mischaracterizes testimony and calls for speculation.

21 THE COURT: Overruled.

22 You may answer, if you know.

23 THE WITNESS: Could you ask the question again?

24 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Well, I'll try.

25 Would it be unusual for high-up administrators at

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Southeastern, like the dean and vice president for academic  
2 affairs, to not follow the collegial recommendation of the  
3 faculty appellate committee?

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. Did you personally believe that Dr. McMillan and  
6 Dr. Scoufos should provide an explanation to Dr. Tudor?

7 A. Yes, I believe that personally.

8 Q. Can you explain why you have that personal belief?

9 A. If I had applied for tenure and promotion and had been  
10 denied, I'd like to know why.

11 Q. I'm going to go back to Exhibit 32. That was, I believe,  
12 the first page I handed you. Okay. I'm trying to make that  
13 readable.

14 So Plaintiff's Exhibit 32, it says that you and the other  
15 members of the faculty appellate committee together agreed  
16 that you thought that dean -- I'm sorry, Dr -- McMillan and  
17 Dr. Scoufos should give explanation to Dr. Tudor; is that  
18 right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. When you -- did you discuss the faculty appellate -- did  
21 you discuss as a group this issue before you issued this  
22 decision as a group?

23 Let me withdraw that question. It was a really bad  
24 question.

25 You conversed with other members of the faculty appellate

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 committee before the committee recommended that administrators  
2 give -- give an explanation to Dr. Tudor; right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did anyone on the committee think that the administrators  
5 should not give an explanation to Dr. Tudor?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Okay. When the faculty appellate committee met and  
8 discussed this, were there particular rules, policies,  
9 precedents, anything that you looked at as a group to come to  
10 your decision?

11 A. We referred to the policies and procedures manual.

12 Q. Do you think it would have been inappropriate for the  
13 faculty appellate committee to look outside of the policies  
14 and procedures manual to make its decision?

15 A. I don't know why we would have wanted to.

16 Q. Why is that?

17 A. Well, we had a specific task in front of us, and it  
18 seemed that the most -- the most logical point of reference  
19 was the policies and procedures manual.

20 Q. Do you think it's important that policies on tenure are  
21 written down?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Do you think it's important that the tenure process is  
24 transparent?

25 A. As much as possible, yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Sitting here today, do you still agree with the decision  
2 that the faculty appellate committee made in this March 25th,  
3 2010, document?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. I'd like to fast-forward to the 2010-11 term. And  
6 I'd like to -- because you were on three of these. I'm only  
7 going to talk about the third one now. Okay?

8 A. Okay.

9 Q. So in the 2010-11 time frame, if a professor applied for  
10 and didn't receive tenure at Southeastern, were they typically  
11 allowed to reapply for tenure?

12 A. Yes, unless the window had closed.

13 Q. What's "the window"?

14 A. Well, a person has a window of time to apply for tenure  
15 and promotion. Generally, they begin on a tenure track --

16 Q. Uh-huh.

17 A. -- and they have four years to demonstrate, for lack of a  
18 better way of saying it, their worth to the university.

19 Q. Uh-huh.

20 A. And then, I believe it's beginning in the fifth year,  
21 they can apply for tenure and promotion. If they choose not  
22 to, they could apply in their sixth year. If they choose not  
23 to or if they were denied, they could apply in their seventh  
24 year.

25 But if they do not have tenure either because they didn't

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 apply or because they were denied, if that's not complete by  
2 the end of the seventh year, then generally they're asked to  
3 move on.

4 Q. I'm sorry. Just to clarify something, so it was your  
5 understanding in this time frame, 2010-11, that someone who is  
6 denied on a tenure application but still had time left within  
7 their seven-year term, they could reapply?

8 A. Yes, within that window.

9 Q. Is there anything specifically that informs your  
10 understanding of what the policy or rule was at Southeastern  
11 in that time frame?

12 A. I believe the policies and procedures manual.

13 Q. Did you look at the policies and procedures manual really  
14 carefully when you were part of these faculty appellate  
15 committees?

16 A. That, I can't remember.

17 Q. Fair enough.

18 So I'm going to introduce another exhibit. Let's see if  
19 I've got this right.

20 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, may I approach the witness  
21 one more --

22 THE COURT: Yes.

23 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

24 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Dr. Knapp, do you recognize Plaintiff's  
25 Exhibit 116?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What is it?

3 A. It's my handwriting.

4 Q. Okay.

5 MR. YOUNG: Based on that alone, Your Honor, I'd  
6 like to admit Plaintiff's Exhibit 116 into evidence.

7 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Admitted.

9 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) So can you describe to the jury what these  
10 are -- I assume these are your handwritten notes. So what are  
11 these notes from?

12 A. This would have been a meeting of another faculty  
13 appellate committee in which I was summarizing our purpose for  
14 meeting.

15 Q. And what was the purpose of that meeting?

16 A. Let me finish reading it.

17 Q. No problem.

18 A. And our response to Dr. Tudor's appeal. That was all in  
19 this document.

20 Q. Do you remember what Dr. Tudor was appealing in this  
21 instance?

22 A. She wanted to apply again for tenure and promotion, and  
23 Dr. McMillan had sent her a letter that said it was -- it was  
24 too soon after being denied for her to apply again.

25 And Dr. Tudor appealed that decision, and the faculty

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 appellate committee supported Dr. Tudor's appeal.

2 Q. Can you educate the jury a little bit about why the  
3 faculty appellate committee, in this third instance, supported  
4 Dr. Tudor?

5 A. There was not a policy that we could find that said she  
6 couldn't. And as a faculty appellate committee, we would  
7 generally side with the faculty in matters where the policies  
8 and procedures manual didn't say anything.

9 Q. If there were a policy that foreclosed reapplication, do  
10 you think that the faculty appellate committee would have  
11 still sided with Dr. Tudor?

12 A. If there was a policy that said she could not?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. I can't speak for the whole committee, but if a policy  
15 said she could not, then that's what I would have supported,  
16 that she could not if the policy was in place.

17 Q. Do you think it would have inflamed the relations between  
18 the faculty and the administration if Dr. Tudor had been  
19 allowed to reapply for tenure in 2010-11?

20 A. No.

21 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
22 speculation.

23 THE COURT: Overruled.

24 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

25 No.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) What's the basis of your answer?

2 A. I voted for -- I thought she should be allowed to  
3 reapply. The faculty appellate committee thought she should  
4 be allowed to reapply. We weren't speaking for all the  
5 faculty, but I didn't think it would create unnecessary  
6 tension between the faculty and the administration.

7 Q. Do you have any recollection of how the Southeastern  
8 administration responded to the faculty appellate committee's  
9 decision in this third appeal?

10 A. I can't remember.

11 Q. Okay. I have one more exhibit for you, and it's out of  
12 order. I apologize. I had it at the bottom of my stack.

13 MR. YOUNG: May I approach, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

16 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Dr. Knapp, do you recognize Plaintiff's  
17 Exhibit 97?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Can you tell me what it is?

20 A. May I have a moment to read it --

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. -- or glance through it?

23 Q. Yes.

24 A. It appears to be a summary of the faculty appellate  
25 committee's response to a grievance dated October 11th of

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 2010.

2 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, I would like to admit  
3 Plaintiff's Exhibit 97 into evidence.

4 MR. BUNSON: No objection, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Admitted.

6 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Now, sitting here today, Dr. Knapp, do you  
7 still agree with the decision that this third faculty  
8 appellate committee made?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. I have a few more questions for you, and then  
11 we're done.

12 Dr. Knapp, do you recall agreeing with me during your  
13 deposition that you had never heard of a professor at  
14 Southeastern encountering the sort obstacles that Dr. Tudor  
15 did during her tenure and promotion process?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. For you, is there anything that makes Dr. Tudor's process  
18 stand out from other tenure processes -- or examples?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What is that?

21 A. I had to be on the faculty appellate committee three  
22 times.

23 Q. So this isn't normal?

24 A. Not for me. And I don't think it's normal for the  
25 faculty.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. At the time that you sat on those faculty  
2 appellate committees, was there ever any discussion about  
3 Dr. McMillan's role in Dr. Tudor's tenure process?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Can you tell me just generally what those conversations  
6 were about?

7 A. It seemed that the application was stopping with  
8 Dr. McMillan.

9 Q. Are you aware of Dr. McMillan stopping any other faculty  
10 member's tenure application at Southeastern?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Sitting here today, do you still believe that Dr. Tudor  
13 should have been permitted to reapply for tenure in 2010-2011?

14 A. Yes, as long as the window was not closed.

15 Q. Okay.

16 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Dr. Knapp. That's all I  
17 have.

18 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

19 BY MR. BUNSON:

20 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Knapp. I'm going to try to get  
21 through this pretty quickly.

22 Did Dr. Tudor ever inform any of the three faculty  
23 appellate committees you sat on that she was offered an  
24 opportunity to withdraw her application and resubmit it?

25 A. Not that I remember.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Did Dr. Tudor inform the committee that had she taken the  
2 offer, she would have -- it would have granted her an eighth  
3 year at the university in order to obtain tenure and  
4 promotion?

5 A. Not that I recall.

6 Q. And you recall earlier testifying about the Academic  
7 Policies and Procedures Manual; is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And that that manual describes the role of faculty and  
10 administration in the tenure and promotion decision process?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And per the policies, do you think that faculty and  
13 administration have an equal voice in the decision-making  
14 process when it comes to tenure and promotion?

15 A. Generally, yes.

16 Q. Now, you were handed some exhibits about the denial of  
17 Dr. Tudor's requests; correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And one of those was the faculty appellate committee's  
20 determination that says that they should give their reasoning  
21 for denying Dr. Tudor's tenure application; is that correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. It doesn't say -- does the policy say when they should  
24 give that feedback?

25 A. Not the part that's in -- excuse me. Not the part that's

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 in the response that I wrote.

2 Q. With your understanding of the Academic Policies and  
3 Procedures Manual, is there anything that says when that  
4 feedback should be coming?

5 A. Not that I'm aware of.

6 Q. Didn't the administration ultimately tell Dr. Tudor the  
7 reasons for her denial?

8 A. I don't recall.

9 Q. Earlier, you also said that, as a member of the faculty  
10 appellate committee, you generally side with the faculty.

11 Do you recall that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you especially side with the faculty if the policy is  
14 silent; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And, here, the policy was silent; correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So it wasn't that the policy wasn't being followed; it  
19 was just that there was no guideline. Is that also correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you know of anyone that has ever been denied tenure by  
22 the president or at the president's level and then allowed to  
23 reapply after that?

24 A. No.

25 Q. But you do know that faculty can withdraw their

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 applications or portfolios in the tenure and promotion process  
2 and resubmit them at a later date; correct?

3 A. I know that now.

4 MR. BUNSON: Thank you, sir. No further questions.

5 THE COURT: Redirect?

6 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

7 BY MR. YOUNG:

8 Q. I'll try to make this real quick, and then you can drive  
9 home.

10 Dr. Knapp, is there -- at the time you were on these  
11 three faculty appellate committees, was there any policy in  
12 the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual that specifically  
13 said that, if application was denied by the president of the  
14 university, that there was no possibility for reapplication?

15 A. Not that I'm aware of.

16 Q. Do you think, if there were such a rule, you would have  
17 been aware of it after these three grievances?

18 A. I think we would have looked pretty closely in the  
19 policies and procedures manual --

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. -- for something like that.

22 Q. One last question.

23 Are you still confident that you still to this day agree  
24 with your decision as part of the first faculty appellate  
25 committee as well as the third faculty appellate committee?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you. Nothing further.

3 THE COURT: You may step down.

4 (Witness excused.)

5 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

6 MR. YOUNG: Calling Ms. Mindy House, Melinda "Mindy"  
7 House. One of my colleagues will go get her.

8 THE COURT: Please come forward. Come right up here  
9 next to the witness box and face the clerk and be sworn.

10 (Witness duly sworn.)

11 THE COURT: Be seated right here. We need to be  
12 able to hear you, so speak into that microphone.

13 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

14 WHEREUPON, MELINDA HOUSE, after having been first duly  
15 sworn, testifies in reply to the questions propounded as  
16 follows:

17 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

18 BY MR. YOUNG:

19 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. House.

20 A. Good afternoon.

21 Q. Thank you for being patient with us today.

22 Ms. House, did you used to work at Southeastern?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Why don't we start back to when you first started working  
25 at Southeastern. Okay?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 When about was that?

2 A. August of '98.

3 Q. Have you had other family members who have worked at  
4 Southeastern?

5 A. My husband worked there, when he went through his  
6 undergraduate and master's, as a campus police officer.

7 Q. Okay. And when did you stop working for Southeastern?

8 A. February -- well, January, February of '16.

9 Q. 2016?

10 A. 2016.

11 Q. Okay. And did your husband stop working for Southeastern  
12 at some point?

13 A. Yes. He got his master's in education, and then he  
14 became a manager at a company in -- MEMC in Sherman, Texas.  
15 Then he was going to come back to Southeastern and be a police  
16 officer, but he passed away.

17 Q. Okay. Do you feel like you have deep ties to  
18 Southeastern?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Can you share with the jury how strongly you feel about  
21 Southeastern?

22 A. When I started at Southeastern, I started in Upward  
23 Bound, which is a TRIO program for low-income first-generation  
24 students. All those kids became my kids. My boys -- in fact,  
25 my husband would -- he was a swimmer. So on all-sports

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 weekend, he would do swimming with the kids.

2 When he passed away, my kids were raised with my Upward  
3 Bound kids because they were 3 and 9. So I had to take them  
4 with me.

5 I went from there to academic affairs office, from  
6 academic affairs to the dean of school of arts and sciences,  
7 to the dean of instruction, which merged.

8 My mom worked for Southeastern per se. She ran the  
9 credit union, the teachers' credit union. My dad has worked  
10 at Southeastern back in the '80s. So -- my sister graduated  
11 from there. My brother-in-law graduated from there.

12 My husband is buried in a Southeastern police uniform.  
13 So I have very strong ties.

14 Q. Thank you for sharing that with us.

15 A. You're welcome.

16 Q. Have you ever had conversations with Douglas McMillan,  
17 the former vice president of academic affairs at Southeastern,  
18 where he shared with you his religious beliefs?

19 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. This is  
20 hearsay.

21 THE WITNESS: Do you contend this falls outside the  
22 hearsay rule?

23 MR. YOUNG: I merely asked if she ever had such  
24 conversations, not what was said.

25 THE COURT: All right.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Okay. Did you think the conversations you  
3 had with Douglas McMillan where religion was brought up were  
4 appropriate?

5 A. No. It had to do with my employment.

6 Q. Did Douglas McMillan make an employment decision --

7 A. Yeah.

8 Q. -- on the basis of his religion?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Did that make you feel uncomfortable?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did Douglas McMillan frequently bring up his religion at  
13 work?

14 A. I don't know frequently, but, yes --

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. -- occasionally from time to time.

17 Q. Okay. I'm going to focus on the time that you worked  
18 with Dean Lucretia Scoufos. Okay?

19 Do you remember when about you started working for Dean  
20 Lucretia Scoufos?

21 A. I want to say it was '08. Dr. Mangrum had retired, and  
22 she came in as a -- from a chair of a department to the dean.

23 Q. And when about did you stop working for Dean Scoufos?

24 A. January, February 2016.

25 Q. Okay. What was your position when you worked with

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Dean Scoufos?

2 A. I was her administrative assistant.

3 Q. So as Dean Scoufos's administrative assistant, did you  
4 have opportunity to be around her and talk with her a lot?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you overhear conversations?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask you about things you may have  
9 witnessed having to do with Dr. Tudor's 2009-10 tenure  
10 application. Okay?

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. I think other folks in this trial have testified about  
13 e-mails that you've been on.

14 Did you schedule meetings for Dean Scoufos?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Is that one of the big parts of your job?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. Do you recall Dr. Tudor meeting with Dean Scoufos  
19 sometime in the tenure process?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. What do you recall?

22 A. I think she met with her twice. I know she met with her  
23 for a portfolio review.

24 The dean started meeting with all of the faculty. She  
25 adopted how she wanted each portfolio to look, you know, the

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 same. And so she had them put them in sleeves, certain  
2 sleeves, books, binders, and in a certain category order. So  
3 she met with her then.

4 And then I recall that she met with her and -- I want to  
5 say it was Randy Prus, Dr. Prus, the chair. I'm not sure what  
6 that meeting was about; I just know she had me write an  
7 acknowledgment form for her -- for Dr. Tudor to sign.

8 Q. Okay. We'll get back to that later.

9 So you worked for Dean Scoufos for a number of years?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. What was Dean Scoufos's usual practice when a portfolio  
12 came into the dean's office, a tenure portfolio for review?

13 A. When they would all come in, then she would review them  
14 one at a time. And then she would write her recommendation of  
15 whether to or against and put that in. Then we were to send  
16 those over to Dr. McMillan.

17 Q. Because Dr. McMillan was the next step --

18 A. Step.

19 Q. -- on the process?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. Was there anything unusual that you recall about  
22 how Dean Scoufos dealt with Dr. Tudor's tenure application?

23 A. I know that there were conversations back and forth over  
24 the phone with Dr. McMillan and there were some rewrites of  
25 her letters as far as whether she wanted to agree or disagree.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. I'm sorry. When you say "agree or disagree," agree or  
2 disagree with whom, if you know?

3 A. With the committee or with herself, you know, saying that  
4 she agreed that she should get tenure or that she shouldn't  
5 get tenure. Her recommendation, I guess is what I'm saying.

6 Q. Okay. So did you ever see Dean Scoufos act like that  
7 with a tenure application before or after?

8 A. No.

9 Q. So it was unusual for you?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. To your recollection, did Dean Scoufos get in  
12 contact with Doug McMillan before Dean Scoufos wrote a letter  
13 on Dr. Tudor's tenure application?

14 A. Yes. They spoke before the portfolio went over to his  
15 office.

16 Q. Was that, in your observation, unusual?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Did you ever see it happen at any other time she reviewed  
19 a portfolio?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Do you know how Dean Scoufos ultimately voted on  
22 Dr. Tudor's portfolio? Do you know what Dean Scoufos's  
23 decision was on Dr. Tudor's application?

24 A. It was not to renew.

25 Q. Okay. I'm going to move you forward in time a little

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 bit. Okay?

2 Do you recall Dean Scoufos having a meeting with  
3 Dr. Tudor a little bit after Dean Scoufos voted to deny  
4 Tudor's application?

5 A. I think that's when she came back and wanted the  
6 acknowledgment paper that she wanted me to write saying that  
7 whatever she was giving Dr. Tudor, that Dr. Tudor had received  
8 it.

9 Q. Okay. I'm going to move you forward in time a little bit  
10 again, in the 2010-11 school year. Okay?

11 Do you recall any meeting between Dean Scoufos,  
12 Dr. Tudor, and anyone else that school year?

13 I'll withdraw that question.

14 I believe earlier you mentioned that you recalled at some  
15 point -- maybe you don't recall the date --

16 A. Yeah.

17 Q. -- that there was a meeting between Dr. Tudor, I think  
18 you said Randy Prus, and Dr. Scoufos.

19 Do you recall that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you recall anything unusual about that meeting?

22 A. No. I mean, Dr. Tudor didn't look happy when she left,  
23 and the dean was upset after she left because she did not sign  
24 a piece of paper.

25 Q. Who didn't sign a piece of paper?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Dr. Tudor.

2 Q. Okay. I'll move you forward in time a little bit again.

3 At some point while Dr. Tudor was still working at  
4 Southeastern, were you asked to monitor Dr. Tudor's blog?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Who asked you to monitor Dr. Tudor's blog?

7 A. Dean Scoufos.

8 Q. Do you know what the purpose of you monitoring that blog  
9 was?

10 A. She had found out that some students and some faculty had  
11 started a petition and a blog, and so she had me go through  
12 and print those off on a daily basis and look up and see what  
13 faculty were supporting and what students, if they were  
14 students, were supporting.

15 And she, I'm assuming, kept those in a file. I printed  
16 them and gave them to her.

17 Q. Was that an unusual thing for Dean Scoufos to tell you to  
18 do?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Had you ever been asked to do anything like that before?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Did Dean Scoufos appear upset when you identified  
23 students and faculty who supported Dr. Tudor?

24 A. Yes. She didn't know the students, but she knew the  
25 faculty members. And so she was upset that they were

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 supporting Dr. Tudor.

2 I think it was Meg Cotter-Lynch and Dr. Spencer were two  
3 of the ones that I recall.

4 Q. Was Dean Scoufos very upset? annoyed? How would you  
5 describe her reaction?

6 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for  
7 speculation.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 MR. BUNSON: Dean Scoufos can talk about that.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Did Dean Scoufos visibly show a reaction?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Could you describe the reaction you saw?

14 A. She was very upset. She was mad. It became obvious to  
15 myself and -- at the way that she spoke about these professors  
16 from then on.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. Is that what you mean?

19 Q. Yes. Thank you.

20 Either when Dr. Tudor still worked at Southeastern or  
21 after she left, did you ever hear administrators say negative  
22 things about Dr. Tudor because she is transgender?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Did you hear negative things from Douglas McMillan?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. BUNSON: Objection. That's hearsay, Your Honor.

2 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Did you hear negative things --

3 THE COURT: Wait a minute.

4 I'm sorry. What?

5 MR. BUNSON: The objection was this is hearsay.

6 THE COURT: Come to the bench.

7 (The following proceedings were had at the bench and out  
8 of the hearing of the jury.)

9 THE COURT: How do you contend this is not hearsay?

10 MR. YOUNG: Statements by party opponents. These  
11 are decision-makers in the high levels of the administration  
12 who have said negative things about Dr. Tudor. They are  
13 contending that these people --

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 Your response?

16 MR. BUNSON: My response, Your Honor, is all of  
17 these witnesses can testify as to what they said. These  
18 aren't -- I completely disagree that these are statements  
19 against interests or statements that can't be cleared up --

20 THE COURT: Why?

21 MR. BUNSON: -- by the person themselves. She's  
22 saying she heard it. It's still an out-of-court statement.

23 THE COURT: Yes. And it was said by Dr. McMillan  
24 and Dean Scoufos, who are policymakers for your client. That  
25 makes them parties. And any statement against interest by a

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 party can be used against that party. That makes it not  
2 hearsay.

3 If you have an argument --

4 MS. COFFEY: I don't think it's clear that she heard  
5 these. It sounded like she was repeating.

6 MR. YOUNG: I can make it more clear, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Yeah. But I think it's important that  
8 this is an exception to the hearsay rule. If it's said by  
9 Dean Scoufos or Dr. McMillan or Mr. Minks, I guess, or  
10 Dr. Whoever -- Minks, you may cross on that.

11 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 MR. BUNSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 (The following proceedings were had in open court with  
14 all parties present and within the hearing of the jury.)

15 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Sorry for that interruption. I tried to  
16 warn you about objections. Stop talking, and we'll try to  
17 stop talking too.

18 Let me just backtrack one question so we can move on.

19 I believe what I was asking is, at any point either after  
20 Dr. Tudor was working at Southeastern or after Dr. Tudor left  
21 Southeastern, did you hear administrators at Southeastern say  
22 negative things about Dr. Tudor because Dr. Tudor is a  
23 transgender woman?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay. Did you hear negative things from Dr. McMillan?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Did you hear negative things from Dr. Scoufos?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did you hear negative things from both of those persons  
5 on more than one occasion?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you about some specific  
8 statements.

9 Did Dr. Scoufos ever tell you that it was weird that  
10 Dr. Tudor is a transgender woman?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Do you recall Dr. Scoufos showing you a picture of  
13 Dr. Tudor and making fun of her?

14 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. This is  
15 leading.

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

17 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

18 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Do you recall having a -- do you recall  
19 having a conversation with Dr. Scoufos where she was  
20 referencing a picture of Dr. Tudor?

21 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. Still leading.

22 THE COURT: I'll give you that one. Overruled.

23 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

24 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) I'll ask it again.

25 Do you recall a conversation between you and Dr. Scoufos

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 where Dr. Scoufos was referencing a picture of Dr. Tudor?

2 A. Yes. She was sitting in a chair, Dr. Tudor was, and she  
3 referenced that she was trying to look feminine but that she  
4 isn't.

5 Q. Did Dr. Scoufos ever criticize Dr. Tudor's clothing  
6 choices?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. What do you recall?

9 A. The dean is very fashion-forward. You know, she's very  
10 well put together. And she just said that Dr. Tudor was  
11 trying to dress like a female but that she's not.

12 Q. Did Dr. Scoufos ever criticize Dr. Tudor's voice?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. On more than one occasion?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What was the criticism?

17 A. That Dr. Tudor was trying to have a -- like a whispering  
18 voice to not sound so -- like a male, and that it was very  
19 raspy.

20 Q. Did Dr. Scoufos ever mock Tudor's voice?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Did Dr. Scoufos ever imitate Tudor's voice?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. On more than one occasion?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Do you recall the period when Dr. Tudor started first  
2 complaining about discrimination at Southeastern, just  
3 generally?

4 A. Generally, yes.

5 Q. Okay. Did Dr. Scoufos ever tell you that she,  
6 Dr. Scoufos, thought that Dr. Tudor was using the fact that  
7 she was transgender to complain unfairly about things?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Did Dr. Scoufos ever comment to you and ask you whether  
10 Dr. Tudor had had "the surgery"?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did you ever overhear Doug McMillan mocking, making fun  
13 of, or making negative comments about Dr. Tudor?

14 A. I didn't hear him making fun of Dr. Tudor. I did hear  
15 a -- not a nice comment.

16 Q. Okay. Did you ever hear Doug McMillan say that he didn't  
17 agree with Dr. Tudor's lifestyle?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Did you ever overhear Doug McMillan tell Dean Scoufos  
20 that he did not think that Dr. Tudor should be allowed to use  
21 the women's restroom?

22 A. Yes. He said that he had never told Dr. Tudor that she  
23 could not use the women's restroom, but that he did not  
24 believe or feel like she should be allowed to.

25 Q. From your perspective, as someone who is working around

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 these administrators and on the Southeastern campus, did it  
2 seem like Dr. Tudor was enduring hostilities?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. If you were in Dr. Tudor's shoes, would you have found it  
5 hostile?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. I'm going to flash forward.

8 After this lawsuit was filed, did you ever witness  
9 Dean Scoufos tell department chairs and other administrators  
10 at Southeastern that they should not dig for documents needed  
11 for the litigation?

12 A. Yes. She told -- I think it was Claire Stubblefield  
13 asked for some information and that they needed it in a  
14 certain amount of time frame. And a few of those department  
15 chairs came in and stated that, because of the timeline, they  
16 didn't know if they could fulfill that deadline and some of  
17 the people that were in certain positions were no longer in  
18 those positions, so getting them to go back and pull stuff  
19 would be hard as well.

20 So she told them that -- not to manufacture anything, but  
21 that they also didn't have to dig for anything.

22 Q. Were you concerned -- were you personally concerned by  
23 that comment?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Can you explain to the jury why you were concerned?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Because I didn't feel that hiding anything from anyone  
2 was going to do justice for either side.

3 Q. You mean Dr. Tudor or Southeastern?

4 A. Right.

5 Q. Okay. After this lawsuit was filed, did you ever hear  
6 Dr. Scoufos tell someone at Southeastern that, if Dr. Tudor  
7 won her lawsuit and returned to Southeastern, that Dr. Scoufos  
8 and Dr. McMillan would quit?

9 A. Yes.

10 MR. BUNSON: Objection, Your Honor. This is  
11 hearsay.

12 THE COURT: Overruled.

13 THE WITNESS: Oh, I can answer?

14 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) You can answer.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What do you recall about that conversation that you  
17 heard?

18 A. Dr. Weger came into the office and was sitting in front  
19 of my desk --

20 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I misunderstood who the  
21 speaker was.

22 That objection is sustained.

23 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Let me reframe the question.

24 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) What did you hear -- and only answer the  
25 question I'm asking.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 What did you hear Dean Scoufos say to Dr. Weger?

2 A. That if Dr. Tudor came back to the university to work,  
3 that her and Dr. McMillan would quit and no longer work there.

4 MR. YOUNG: May I approach, Your Honor?

5 THE COURT: The witness or --

6 MR. YOUNG: Approach you for a second with counsel.

7 THE COURT: Yes.

8 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

9 (The following proceedings were had at the bench and out  
10 of the hearing of the jury.)

11 MR. YOUNG: I believe you held in abeyance so you  
12 could see or hear in context whether witnesses could testify  
13 about the circumstances of the retirement of some of the key  
14 decision-makers at Southeastern. This witness is prepared to  
15 testify about those circumstances.

16 So I wanted to not ask it in front of the jury but to do  
17 it here first.

18 MS. COFFEY: Your Honor, the ruling was that they  
19 could testify; they couldn't make any assumptions as to why  
20 somebody retired.

21 This witness has laid no foundation for that whatsoever.  
22 She just testified that if Dr. Tudor returned to campus, they  
23 would quit. Dr. Tudor hasn't returned to campus. Those two  
24 individuals retired, and it had nothing to do with this case,  
25 and there's no evidence to show otherwise.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. YOUNG: That's not the context, Your Honor, and  
2 I can share it here if you need that first.

3 THE COURT: Context of what?

4 MR. YOUNG: What the testimony is going to --

5 THE COURT: What is her testimony going to be?

6 MR. YOUNG: She is going to state that she does have  
7 knowledge of the circumstances surrounding why Scoufos left,  
8 and it was because she was fired because of what she had to do  
9 with Dr. Tudor.

10 THE COURT: Is Dr. Scoufos going to be a witness?

11 MS. COFFEY: Absolutely, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: That can't come in through this witness.

13 MR. YOUNG: May I reserve that? Dr. Scoufos  
14 testified at her deposition that she retired from Southeastern  
15 of her own volition, that it was not discipline, and it  
16 nothing to do with Dr. Tudor or this case.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. YOUNG: So I need this witness to testify to  
19 this so I can use it to impeach Dr. Scoufos.

20 THE COURT: You can't impeach another witness with  
21 this witness.

22 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

23 (The following proceedings were had in open court with  
24 all parties present and within the hearing of the jury.)

25 Q. (BY MR. YOUNG) Now, Ms. House, a few more questions. I

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 can only ask you a couple of questions about this issue, so  
2 listen carefully to the questions I am asking you. Okay?

3 When about did Dean Scoufos announce that she was going  
4 to retire from Southeastern?

5 A. It was towards the end of 2015. She had been out with  
6 open heart surgery.

7 Q. Uh-huh.

8 A. And so when she came back, she had a meeting with  
9 Dr. McMillan, and then she -- day after that, she announced  
10 that she was going to retire.

11 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that Dean Scoufos did  
12 not seek out retirement?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Can you share your reason for thinking that with the  
15 jury?

16 A. When she was out with her heart surgery and her rehab, I  
17 specifically asked her, because they were doing buyouts, if  
18 she was going to retire. And she said, no, that she didn't  
19 work that hard to come back to retire and had me working on  
20 different things that were going to be in the future,  
21 symposiums and lectureships and stuff.

22 Q. Okay. Did Dr. Scoufos ever tell you that she thought  
23 Claire Stubblefield was an idiot who gave too much information  
24 regarding Dr. Tudor's issues at Southeastern out to the EEOC  
25 and through this lawsuit?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, Ms. House, I know this part is sort of painful, but  
3 it's relevant.

4 Were you fired from Southeastern?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Why do you believe you were fired from Southeastern?

7 A. I believe I was fired from Southeastern because of this  
8 case.

9 Q. And what informs your belief?

10 A. Because the information that was given to me is not  
11 factual. All the appeals process that I went through, even  
12 the committee said that there was no evidence to support. And  
13 I was vocal with the treatment of Dr. Tudor, that I didn't  
14 think it was right. And I had some professors tell me that  
15 that's the reason, that anybody that was remotely around  
16 higher admin during this is all gone. So...

17 Q. Sitting here today, do you regret being vocal about how  
18 wrong it was what happened to Dr. Tudor at Southeastern?

19 A. No. I regret I lost my job. I regret that -- I'm  
20 sorry --

21 Q. It's okay.

22 A. -- that there were certain things said about me that were  
23 not true, said about my boys that were not true, that I'd  
24 given my life to Southeastern and that this was the way that I  
25 was going out the door.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 But, no, right's right. So I don't regret it, saying  
2 anything in support of Dr. Tudor.

3 MR. YOUNG: Thank you so much, Ms. House.

4 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

5 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

6 BY MR. BUNSON:

7 Q. Good morning -- or good afternoon, Ms. House. How are  
8 you?

9 A. I'm okay. How are you?

10 Q. I'm wonderful. Thank you.

11 You have a personal ax to grind here, don't you?

12 A. No, sir.

13 Q. You indicated you were terminated from Southeastern; is  
14 that correct?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. And you were terminated on March 10th, 2016; isn't that  
17 correct?

18 A. Officially, yes, sir.

19 Q. And the reason you are no longer at Southeastern and you  
20 were terminated was because of a, quote, lack of academic  
21 integrity and dishonesty; isn't that correct?

22 A. No, sir.

23 Q. Would it help if I showed you some documents to refresh  
24 your recollection?

25 A. No. I know what I was told, but none of that happened.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. So you were told you were being terminated for lack of  
2 academic integrity and dishonesty; is that correct?

3 A. No. I was told, when I was brought in, that there was an  
4 accusation that a student worker did my son's online math  
5 homework. He didn't take an online math class. And that was  
6 two years prior.

7 And that -- Dean Scoufos told me that they -- I don't  
8 know who "they" are -- had settled with this letter she gave  
9 me saying that I had until three o'clock the next day to  
10 either resign and get my vacation paid for or not resign and  
11 get nothing.

12 MR. BUNSON: Your Honor, may I approach?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Ms. House, will you please turn to Tabs 2  
15 and 3 of the documents I've handed you.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. What is Tab 2?

18 A. It's a second page of a letter from Dr. -- or from  
19 Micah Kelly.

20 Q. Who is -- I believe it's Micah D. Knight, isn't it, at  
21 the very top?

22 A. I'm sorry. Yes.

23 Q. Who is Micah D. Knight?

24 A. She's a lawyer.

25 Q. So you hired a lawyer to represent you in this process of

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 your termination; correct?

2 A. I hired a lawyer to get my vacation pay and to advise me  
3 whether I could be terminated without any kind of cause.

4 Q. If you'd like to go ahead and review that letter, I'm  
5 happy to give you some time.

6 A. Okay. Yes, sir.

7 Q. How long is that letter?

8 A. A page and a half.

9 Q. Anywhere on that first page it talks about you not  
10 getting your back pay?

11 A. On the first page?

12 Q. Yes, ma'am.

13 A. No.

14 Q. And on the second page, about how long is the text on  
15 that second page?

16 A. A paragraph and two sentences and a half.

17 Q. And does that talk about your back pay?

18 A. It says -- yes, that I'm entitled to receive full  
19 payment.

20 Q. So in a page-and-a-half letter, one small paragraph that  
21 talks about your back pay, you're saying you weren't informed  
22 as to why you were being terminated?

23 A. Not when I was -- what I was informed, when she gave me  
24 the letter, was that there was an accusation made from a  
25 student worker in our office. And so that's when I went to

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Micah Kelly -- or Micah Knight.

2 Q. What is this letter dated?

3 A. The 27th of January.

4 Q. And so you weren't terminated until March; correct?

5 A. Correct. Because I appealed.

6 Q. Okay. We'll get to that in a moment.

7 If you could, though, there is -- in that first  
8 paragraph, there is a highlighted sentence.

9 Are you telling me that, based on that highlighted  
10 sentence, you didn't know what you were being accused of on  
11 January 27th, 2016?

12 A. Yes. I said Dr. Scoufos told me that I was accused of a  
13 student worker doing my son's homework.

14 Q. And that was considered an act of dishonesty and lack of  
15 academic integrity, wasn't it?

16 A. Per Southeastern's policy, I'm assuming.

17 Q. You can look at Tab 3 if you'd like.

18 A. "It was the opinion of the committee." Is that what  
19 you're looking at?

20 Q. Yes, ma'am.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So per the policy, you had committed an act of  
23 academic --of dishonesty and lack of academic integrity;  
24 correct?

25 A. I was accused, yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. You appealed that decision, you said; correct?

2 A. Yes. I got the opportunity after I hired the lawyer.

3 Q. And you accused Southeastern of retaliation against you  
4 for being outspoken in your disagreement over how Dr. Tudor  
5 was treated; isn't that correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And was there an investigation into your claims of  
8 retaliation?

9 A. I don't understand.

10 Q. You accused the university of retaliating against you.

11 A. I understand that part.

12 Q. And there was an investigation as to whether or not  
13 retaliation occurred, wasn't there?

14 A. Are you talking about the meeting with the first  
15 committee?

16 Q. Just do me a favor, ma'am, if you wouldn't mind. You can  
17 turn to Tab 5.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. And that is the investigation by the affirmative action  
20 office, isn't it -- or the determination of the affirmative  
21 action office?

22 A. Who is the affirmative action office? I didn't meet with  
23 an affirmative action office.

24 Q. Who did you meet with, ma'am?

25 A. I met with the dean and then my lawyer, and then they

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 called me and said that -- I met with the committee, and they  
2 asked questions. And that's when they told me who was the one  
3 that made the allegation. They said that Dean Scoufos was the  
4 one that made the allegation and gave me a Title IX piece of  
5 paper. So then I had -- that was it.

6 Then I met with -- after that, I met with Claire  
7 Stubblefield and Dean Scoufos and asked them how I had did a  
8 Title IX because I hadn't discriminated against anyone.

9 And Dr. Stubblefield told me that it was a "two-fo," that  
10 the Title IX came in because of my letter from Micah on  
11 Dr. Tudor. And that was basically the only thing that was  
12 asked or said about affirmative action there.

13 Q. Did your attorney write this letter on your behalf?

14 A. The first letter -- or the only letter? Yes, sir.

15 Q. If you would, go back to Tab 2, then, highlighted  
16 section, second paragraph. Read it to yourself.

17 A. On the first page?

18 Q. Yes, ma'am. Does this refresh your recollection as to  
19 whether or not you, through your attorney, accused Doug  
20 McMillan of retaliating against you?

21 A. No. I said that he did. I felt that he did.

22 Q. Okay. So you have -- now, you said that Doug McMillan  
23 accused you of -- or retaliated against you because of your  
24 outspoken support of Dr. Tudor; correct?

25 A. Yes. That's how I feel.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. And an investigation was conducted; correct?

2 A. Not a full investigation.

3 Q. Were you part of that investigation?

4 A. I don't know what you're talking about. Are you talking  
5 about the meeting with the group of people? They didn't ask  
6 very much. They just asked me why I felt that Dr. McMillan  
7 would retaliate against me and had he ever done anything to --  
8 on his belief system. And I said, yes, that he was going  
9 to --

10 THE COURT: Stop, stop. I don't believe this is  
11 responsive.

12 Try again.

13 MR. BUNSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I lost my  
14 place.

15 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Was there an investigation into your  
16 claims of retaliation by Dr. McMillan?

17 A. To my opinion, no. To your opinion, I'm assuming yes.

18 Q. And do you know what the determination was regarding your  
19 accusation of retaliation by Dr. McMillan?

20 A. No.

21 Q. In fact, the committee found that there was no evidence  
22 to indicate that the charges by you were instigated by  
23 Dr. McMillan; isn't that correct?

24 A. Yes, I'm assuming.

25 Q. And this comment you made about Dr. Scoufos is the one

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 that had comments from the students. Do you recall that?

2 A. The comments that -- when she told me in my first meeting  
3 with her?

4 Q. Bad question.

5 Your lack of academic integrity and dishonesty had to do  
6 with the fact that you were accused of having work-study  
7 students do your son's homework; isn't that correct?

8 A. That was the allegation.

9 Q. And they provided testimony in forms of both personal and  
10 written affidavits, didn't they?

11 A. One did. The other one sent an e-mail. I guess that's  
12 written.

13 Q. So written and verbal/oral testimony to the fact that you  
14 asked them to do this; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. If you could, turn to Tab 6, please.

17 Do you recall this document?

18 A. The counseling report?

19 Q. Yes, ma'am.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. What is a counseling report?

22 A. It's where they gave me the allegations in writing.

23 Q. And if you could, just quickly flip over to page 2, red  
24 box.

25 Is that your signature?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What's the date?

3 A. February 12th.

4 Q. Of?

5 A. 2016.

6 Q. And you indicate in there you do not agree; right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. But you were -- you received the fullest of the charges  
9 and accusations of your acts of dishonesty and lack of  
10 academic integrity within this document, didn't you?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And after multiple investigations, a pretermination  
13 hearing, you requested and were granted an appeal hearing,  
14 weren't you?

15 A. That was the meeting with Kyle Stafford, Claire  
16 Stubblefield, and the dean.

17 Q. You can turn to Tab 11 if you'd like.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. Do you recall getting that letter?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. What was that letter dated?

22 A. April 4th.

23 Q. Who's the letter from?

24 A. Dr. Bryon Clark.

25 Q. And it indicates that you -- that he has been put in

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 charge of putting together an appeals committee regarding your  
2 discharge; correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And he tells you who's going to be on that committee;  
5 right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So you were granted an appeal.

8 If you could turn to Tab 12.

9 And the appeal committee determined you had committed an  
10 act of academic dishonesty and that termination was  
11 appropriate; isn't that correct?

12 A. In the bottom -- in the last paragraph?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. That's what this says, yes.

15 Q. And is that signed by the people that were on your  
16 appeals committee per the letter that you were sent?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So after a pretermination hearing, multiple  
19 investigations, and now an appeal, all parties, all  
20 committees, everybody, agreed that you committed lack of  
21 academic integrity and acts of dishonesty; is that correct?

22 A. That's what they say.

23 Q. Okay. Now, to get into some of your testimony from  
24 earlier, you testified to reactions before and after meetings  
25 between Dr. Tudor and Dr. --

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 THE COURT: Let me stop you. I was going to try to  
2 get through with this witness, but I think we all need a  
3 break.

4 Please do not discuss the case. Be back in your room at  
5 3:15. And we'll be in recess.

6 (Jury exits.)

7 (In recess from 3:00 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)

8 (Jury enters.)

9 THE COURT: Be seated.

10 Please proceed.

11 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) Ms. House, would you mind turning to  
12 Tab 11 of that packet again just real quick?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. On the third page of that, you'll see a bulleted list of  
15 names.

16 A. The list at the top?

17 Q. It's a bulleted list of names about three-quarters down,  
18 third page, Tab 11.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay. Thank you.

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. Those are the names of the appeals committee; correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And two of those committee members were secretaries like  
25 yourself; correct? Their title is right next to their name.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Oh. Yes.

2 Q. The first name, Ms. Elizabeth Brittingham?

3 A. Brittingham, yes.

4 Q. Brittingham. My apologies.

5 A. No, that's okay.

6 Q. Do you know who she is?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. You asked for her to be appointed to this committee,  
9 didn't you?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. That was the only name I got --

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. -- or the only position I got.

15 Q. And the other two were a help desk director and  
16 coordinator of disability services.

17 Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. So the secretaries on there, they were your peers,  
20 weren't they?

21 A. I did not work closely with Faith Huddleston. She was in  
22 a different division. I was academic; she was student.

23 Q. But a secretary would be your peer in terms of your level  
24 at the university; correct?

25 A. I would assume so.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Okay. And Ms. Brittingham, you did know her; correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And if you could go to Tab 12, second page, the red box.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. What's the second name signed on there?

6 A. Elizabeth Brittingham.

7 Q. And her signature would show that she concurs with the  
8 appeals committee's decision; correct?

9 A. You would have to ask her.

10 Q. This is a report that was authored by her committee;  
11 correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Earlier, you talked about an employment decision  
14 that Doug McMillan made about you based on his religion.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What employment decision was that?

17 A. When I was moved over to the dean's for arts and  
18 sciences.

19 I was vice president's administrative secretary, Jesse  
20 Snowden, and he became interim president. So when  
21 Dr. McMillan was interim vice president, he said that he was  
22 going to downsize the office, and so that meant that he was  
23 going to do away with my position.

24 But because of his biblical belief that the Bible says  
25 that we take care of our widows, that he would go talk with

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Dr. C.W. Mangrum and see if I could transfer over there  
2 because their secretary was leaving.

3 Q. So that decision was a positive decision, wasn't it?

4 A. As far as?

5 Q. Either having a job or not having a job.

6 A. If you look at it that way, yes.

7 Q. You told us earlier that Dean Scoufos and Dr. McMillan  
8 said negative comments related to Dr. Tudor being transgender.

9 Do you recall that?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. You never repeated -- or reported these accusations  
12 before you were under investigation or during your  
13 investigation, did you?

14 A. Report to who?

15 Q. The equal employment opportunity officer.

16 A. There was -- no.

17 Q. And you knew the investigation into Dr. Tudor's tenure  
18 denial; right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. This was in 2010, 2011, and 2012; right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And yet you never reported any of these statements to  
23 Southwestern -- Southeastern's affirmative action officer, did  
24 you?

25 A. No, because it would not have done any good.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. You didn't report these statements to anyone, did you?

2 A. My dean.

3 Q. Lucretia Scoufos?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So six years after Dr. Tudor's tenure denial, you started  
6 claiming your firing was because of your support for  
7 Dr. Tudor; isn't that correct?

8 A. Six years?

9 Q. Yes, ma'am.

10 A. You mean when I got let go, that I said it was -- I felt  
11 that it was part of that?

12 Q. Yes. When you were terminated --

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. -- you are claiming that that was because you were  
15 supporting Dr. Tudor; right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And that was six years -- six years after her denial of  
18 tenure; correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. So you think that requiring student aides to do your  
21 son's homework had nothing to do with your firing?

22 A. I didn't do that.

23 Q. So you're calling Justin Harp and Cristin Morgan liars?

24 A. I guess so.

25 Q. If you could turn to Tab 12, please.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 This is that appeals committee's determination; correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And in the final paragraph, it says, "One of the  
4 students, Cristin Morgan, explained to us different versions  
5 of events" -- or "a different version of events." My  
6 apologies.

7 "She asserted that over the course of at least two days  
8 she was asked to spend between two and three hours on course  
9 work that was not merely a study guide and completed  
10 computer-based modules in a course-management system on  
11 Ms. House's workstation computer, including at times when  
12 Ms. House temporarily left the office.

13 "This claim is supported by a second student, Justin  
14 Harp, who was unavailable to us at the time of the  
15 informational hearing but whose corroborating statement was  
16 available to us."

17 Did I read that correctly?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. So you still maintain that they are liars?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Ms. House, so the appeals committee, pretermination  
22 committee, and all investigating bodies determined that you  
23 lied, didn't they?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Which one didn't?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Well, they even state back here that it says, "The  
2 mitigating factors in this case include that the facts in  
3 question are from two years, cover relatively brief episode  
4 over the course of overall employment, and that there is no  
5 allegation of any ongoing or systematic issues with integrity  
6 on the part of the appealing party. For this reason, we  
7 believe discharge was not the only possible course but only  
8 one of the menu of options that could have reasonably been  
9 pursued."

10 Q. And the following paragraph, if you will, says, "That  
11 said, committing an act of academic dishonesty while working  
12 in the office of the executive dean of academic affairs is  
13 particularly serious."

14 Did I read that correctly?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. "The conduct that we believe happened here meets the  
17 handbook's list of actions that at least minimally qualify an  
18 employee for discharge as a penalty."

19 Did I read that correctly?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. "With discharge being one of the appropriate options for  
22 penalty and with it being exercised here in fair accordance  
23 with the text of the handbook, we find it appropriate to  
24 uphold the decision upon appeal."

25 Did I read that correctly?

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. So you still maintain that they did not say that you  
3 lied?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Do you maintain that they hold that you committed acts of  
6 academic dishonesty?

7 MR. YOUNG: Objection. Asked and answered, Your  
8 Honor.

9 THE COURT: Sustained.

10 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) So based on all these findings of all of  
11 these different committees --

12 A. Two committees.

13 MR. YOUNG: Objection. Asked and answered.

14 THE COURT: It hasn't been asked yet. I don't know.

15 Q. (BY MR. BUNSON) So there is no reason -- sorry.

16 So based on the fact that the appeals committee,  
17 pretermination committee, and all investigations into this  
18 allegation against you determined that you were dishonest, is  
19 there any reason to think that you wouldn't lie here today?

20 A. Because I'm not dishonest.

21 Q. Were you friends with Lucretia Scoufos?

22 A. As far as close friends --

23 Q. Yes.

24 A. -- or business friends?

25 Q. Friends. You can decide.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 A. Not "friend" friends. I worked with her for many years.

2 Q. Are you friends with her now?

3 A. No.

4 MR. BUNSON: No further questions.

5 THE COURT: Redirect?

6 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

7 BY MR. YOUNG:

8 Q. Ms. House, is Dean Scoufos the one who first accused you  
9 of dishonesty?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And is Dean Scoufos the one who first notified you that  
12 you were going to be terminated?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And at some point did Claire Stubblefield conduct an  
15 investigation?

16 A. No, not till after they got my letter from Micah Knight.  
17 Then they said -- they sent a letter -- Claire Stubblefield  
18 sent an e-mail saying that they were extending my leave of  
19 absence past the three o'clock the next day to another day.  
20 And then that's when they had a committee.

21 Q. Last year --

22 A. Uh-huh.

23 Q. -- did you receive a subpoena in this case to testify at  
24 a deposition?

25 A. Yes.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 Q. Were you prepared to tell the truth at that deposition?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Was that deposition canceled by the lawyers involved and  
4 not you?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you tell the truth today, Ms. House?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Was it hard for you to come here today?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Are you losing money from work to be here today?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Sitting here today, do you regret your decision to bury  
13 your husband in his Southeastern uniform?

14 A. I do and I don't.

15 Q. Can you explain that answer?

16 A. I do because I never felt like the dishonesty that goes  
17 on and that I've seen would get this bad. And I don't because  
18 I love Southeastern even after everything. It's still home.  
19 So no.

20 MR. YOUNG: Nothing further, Your Honor.

21 MR. BUNSON: Nothing further.

22 THE COURT: You may step down.

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

24 (Witness excused.)

25 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, respectfully, plaintiff  
2 rests.

3 May I approach?

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

6 (The following proceedings were had at the bench and out  
7 of the hearing of the jury.)

8 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. Respectfully,  
9 plaintiff would like to move for a directed verdict. I'm  
10 prepared to make arguments today or we can make them tomorrow.

11 THE COURT: Well, I certainly don't want to hear  
12 them today.

13 How -- what do you think is your best guess on your  
14 evidence now?

15 MS. COFFEY: Well, before I get there, defendants  
16 also would like to move for a directed verdict.

17 Is it on the record, plaintiff has rested?

18 THE COURT: Yes.

19 MS. COFFEY: Okay. So plaintiff is not going to  
20 present deposition testimony of Cathy Conway during your case?

21 MR. YOUNG: (Shakes head.)

22 But we reserve the right, if there's no directed verdict,  
23 to present rebuttal.

24 MS. COFFEY: I think that we --

25 THE COURT: Sherri, we'll be off the record.

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

1 (Bench conference held off the record with all counsel.)

2 (The following proceedings were had in open court with  
3 all parties present and within the hearing of the jury.)

4 THE COURT: This is a point in the trial where the  
5 lawyers and I need to have some time to do several things, and  
6 I don't want you to have to sit there and listen to us  
7 whisper. And it may take long enough that it will be by the  
8 end of the day that we're finished anyway.

9 So, once again, I'm going to send you home early. I  
10 think it really is a nice day today, although I can't vouch  
11 for that.

12 I will instruct you not to discuss the case, of course,  
13 or permit anyone to discuss it with you. Do not expose  
14 yourselves to any media accounts. Don't do any independent  
15 research, Facebook, social media, Twitter, blog, or anything  
16 else. Please be in the jury assembly room downstairs by 9:15  
17 tomorrow, and we will excuse you.

18 I will expect counsel in chambers.

19 And we'll be in recess.

20 (In recess at 3:45 p.m.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Jury Trial - Volume 3  
November 15, 2017

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SHERRI GRUBBS, Federal Official Court Reporter in  
and for the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that pursuant to  
Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the foregoing  
is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically  
reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and  
that the transcript page format is in conformance with the  
regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated this 15th day of November, 2017.

/S/ SHERRI GRUBBS

SHERRI GRUBBS, RPR, RMR, RDR, CRR  
State of Oklahoma CSR No. 1232.  
Federal Official Court Reporter